

*Junior
College
Journal*

MAY 1957 : VOLUME XXVII : NUMBER 9

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

The American Association of Junior Colleges will make available to libraries the present and future volumes of the *Junior College Journal* in microfilm form. Inquiries should be directed to University Microfilm, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

VOLUME XXVII

MAY 1957

NUMBER 9

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS	<i>James M. Ewing</i>	483
GREETING TO JUNIOR COLLEGES	<i>George D. Clyde</i>	487
YOUR THEME—AND THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE	<i>Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.</i>	490
THE ROLE OF COLLEGE EDUCATION IN A FREE SOCIETY	<i>Frank Church</i>	497
COATS OFF TO THE FUTURE—UNIVERSITIES	<i>James W. Reynolds</i>	504
COATS OFF BY THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	<i>Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.</i>	515
FOLLOW-UP STUDIES IN CO-EDUCATIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGES	<i>Peter Masiko, Jr.</i>	521
THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY' ANNUAL REPORT	<i>Jesse P. Bogue</i>	527
THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF TECHNICAL INSTITUTE EDUCATION		530
AAJC FINANCIAL STATEMENT		534

INDEX

JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL is published monthly from September to May, inclusive. Subscription: \$3.50 a year, 50 cents a copy. Group subscriptions, to faculty of institutions which are members of the American Association of Junior Colleges: \$2.00 a year. Communications regarding editorial matters should be addressed to James W. Reynolds, College of Education, The University of Texas, P.O. Box 7998, Austin 12, Texas. Correspondence regarding advertisements and subscriptions should be addressed to Jesse P. Bogue, executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Entered as second-class matter November 22, 1928, at the Post Office at Washington, D.C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Austin, Texas, August 20, 1949.

[Printed in U. S. A.]

Outstanding **McGRAW-HILL** *Books*

ACCOUNTING FUNDAMENTALS

By **GEORGE A. MacFARLAND**, University of Pennsylvania; **ROBERT D. AYARS**, University of Pittsburgh; and **WILLIARD E. STONE**, University of Pennsylvania. McGraw-Hill Accounting Series. Third Edition. 630 pages, \$6.50

Completely revised and improved, this elementary accounting text can be used either as a sound basis for further accounting study, or by nonmajors as a terminal course. Every effort has been made to define each accounting word, phrase and principle, with the terminology completely revised, and all accounting treatments aligned with the latest accepted good practices. New chapters have been added on accounting for payroll and payroll taxes, plus 297 new problems.

MUSIC: The Listener's Art

By **LEONARD G. RATNER**, Stanford University. 384 pages, \$7.50 (text edition available)

Designed to enrich the listener's enjoyment and understanding of music. It gives him the means by which he can better analyze, evaluate, and appreciate the music he hears. The approach leads from impression, to evaluation, and thence to some insight into the qualities and structure of music. It presents basic and solid orientation in theoretic, stylistic, and historic aspects of music with the relation between musical techniques and expressive values of music the most important idea throughout the text.

ART AND CIVILIZATION

By **BERNARD S. MYERS**, City College of New York, 757 pages, \$9.50 (text edition available)

A stimulating history of world painting, sculpture, and architecture from primitive to modern times, including chapters on the Near and Far East. Here is the first general college text to show both the normal chronological development of the history of art and the social and cultural reasons for these changes. All technical terms are explained as they are used, including a thorough treatment of the recently developed "Mannerist field."

ECONOMICS OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

By **EVAN B. ALDERFER**, University of Pennsylvania; and **H. E. MICHL**, University of Delaware. New Third Edition. Ready in September

A thorough revision of a basic text describing the economics and structure of such major American industries as steel, autos, chemicals, food, and textiles. It portrays the competition prevailing in each industry, with special emphasis given to their peculiar characteristics. Every chapter has been brought up to date, and a completely new set of illustrations added. Here is an impartial treatment showing the strength and weakness in each industry.



Send for copies on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.
330 WEST 42nd STREET, NEW YORK 36, N. Y.

ANNOUNCING . . . A NEW 1957 Third Edition

ECONOMICS

PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS

By J. H. Dodd and C. W. Hasek

A careful, extensive revision has been made of a popular book that made a noteworthy contribution as a teaching tool when it was first published. The materials have been brought up to date. Changes have been made in sequence of chapters to give a more logical organization. Some chapters are combined and others divided to make a book that will be challenging and meaningful. Each chapter is now concluded with a brief summary of the points that have been developed.

ECONOMICS: PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS, Third Edition, contains a suggested outline for a semester course.

SOUTH-WESTERN PUBLISHING CO.

(Specialists in Business and Economic Education)

Cincinnati 27, New Rochelle, N.Y., Chicago 5, San Francisco 3, Dallas 2

First Issue: Autumn, 1957

JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING

A Quarterly for the Improvement of Reading in High School, College, Industrial, Military, and Adult Programs

Subscription, \$3.50 per year

\$3.00 for Teachers

(Please make checks payable to Purdue University)

Address: Editor

**Department of English, Purdue University,
Lafayette, Indiana**



Now, through TIAA's new MAJOR MEDICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE, colleges can help free their staff members from concern over the financial problems of medical care for themselves and their families.

TIAA MAJOR MEDICAL is issued on the Group basis and can be added to a "base plan" such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield or designed to provide the entire medical expense insurance program at the college.

Colleges, universities, independent schools, and certain foundations and other nonprofit educational or research institutions are eligible whether or not they now have a TIAA retirement or insurance program.

To learn more about this important protection, complete and return

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association
522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, New York

Please send information on MAJOR MEDICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE to:

Name _____

Title _____

Employing Institution _____

Address _____

A

New **RONALD** *Books . . .*

COLLEGE WRITING

CECIL B. WILLIAMS, *Oklahoma A. & M. College*; and
JOHN BALL, *Miami University*

Just Published! Comprehensive and functional in its approach, this textbook in composition covers all the types of writing that the student will have to do during his college career. Grammar and rhetoric are dealt with early in the book. The student is then introduced to the elementary writing skills—taking notes, writing examinations, themes, letters, re-

search and book reports. A whole section is devoted to more advanced work—creative writing, nonfiction, journalism, etc. The volume concludes with a complete Writer's Reference Guide and a Correction Chart keyed to the text. Throughout, the book is illustrated with a wide variety of specimen pieces by student and professional writers. 15 ills., 475 pp.

SPANISH FOR BEGINNERS—2nd Edition

NORMAN P. SACKS, Oberlin College

Also new. The Second Edition of this highly successful textbook consists of 22 lessons which can be completed in one semester. Now every lesson is based on a dialogue which introduces the grammar, vocabulary, and idioms of the lesson. The dialogues discuss in conversational Spanish both practical situations and cultural material related to Spain and Latin Amer-

ica. Adaptable to either the oral-aural approach or the reading approach, the book contains an abundance of new exercises, a review after every fifth lesson, and a concluding general review. The material dealing with Spanish phonetics and orthographic change is unsurpassed in modern textbook treatment. *Illus.*, 282 pp.

VARIETIES OF EXPERIENCE

An Introduction to Philosophy

ALBERT WILLIAM LEVI, *Washington University*

Published in March. This new textbook for introductory college courses acquaints the student with the chief areas of philosophy. It consists of lucid expositions of the crucial philosophic problems and a copious selection of writings by the major thinkers of Western tradition ranging from Plato to Tillich. Beginning with

a discussion of the meaning and method of philosophy, the book proceeds to a study of cosmology, ethics, social philosophy, aesthetics, philosophy, and religion. An introduction to each section gives the student guidance in approaching the main philosophic questions.

Bibliographies. 525 pp.

PRINCIPLES OF MARKETING—*Sixth Edition*

THEODORE N. BECKMAN, HAROLD H. MAYNARD, and
WILLIAM R. DAVIDSON—all of The Ohio State University

Just out! The Sixth Edition of the standard textbook in the field of marketing. Book presents a clear-cut picture of the development and present status of the marketing system; analyzes critically the tasks performed in marketing and the various institutions performing them; and examines the major business, economic, and social policies of marketing. Revised and brought completely up-to-date, the

book realistically treats each phase of marketing in a balanced perspective. New material has been added on planned shopping centers, discount houses, nonstore retailing, motivation research, and "value added" as a measure of economic contribution in marketing. Includes abundant new problem material at the end of each chapter.

8 ills., 25 tables, 798 pp.

THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY • 15 East 26th St., New York 10

JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

VOLUME XXVII

MAY 1957

NUMBER 9

President's Address

JAMES M. EWING

I WOULD LIKE to take this opportunity to express to you, representatives of the fastest growing segment of American education, my sincere thanks for the high privilege you have given me to serve as President of the American Association of Junior Colleges for the convention year 1956-1957. For more than 20 years this organization has been very close to my heart. Year in and year out the programs of this Association have been excellent and a great challenge to each person who has attended the annual convention.

This year's program, which I hope you have examined, will be no exception. I can make this statement with all modesty because the entire program is the work of others, principally of your Board of Directors, your committee chairmen, their committee members, and of your most efficient Executive Secretary, Dr. Jesse P. Bogue.

May I also express appreciation to Bill Miller, to the local junior colleges, and the people of Utah who have gone all-out to make our stay in Salt Lake City most pleasant and profitable.

The theme of this convention, "Hats off to the Past—Coats off to the Future," is certainly timely. We should take pride in our past accomplishments and at the same time move forward to the ever challenging opportunities and responsibilities of the present and future.

In recognition of the accomplishments of the past, I shall presume to review for you the progress of the junior college program in my own state of Mississippi. Most of the factual information presented is taken from *History of Mississippi Public Junior Colleges, 1928-1953* authored by Knox M. Broom, for many years a key figure in the state and national program. For doing this I offer no apology: We are proud of our system of junior colleges. Having spent 28 years in this program I know it fairly well; also I know that junior college progress in Mississippi is symbolic of the progress of the average state—of course none of us would suggest that we are in the class with California or Texas. They vie only with each other.

Hinds Junior College and Pearl River Junior College offered work beyond the high school as early as 1922. The first comprehensive Public Junior College Law was enacted by the Mississippi legislature in 1928. It set up a Junior College Commission to "regulate the establishment and operation of public junior colleges." This Commission was composed of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as ex-officio chairman, the Chancellor of the University, the President of Mississippi State College, the President of Mississippi State College for Women, and three junior college presidents selected by the junior college group. Though the laws have

since been completely re-written, this Commission has continued with the same membership positions. The law provides that the Commission shall have the following powers and duties: (1) to make studies, (2) to divide the state into districts, (3) to fix standards, (4) to certify annually to the State Board of Education the junior colleges eligible for state funds. The Executive Secretary of the Commission is the State Supervisor of Junior Colleges, currently Mr. B. L. Hill.

This same 1928 legislature appropriated \$80,000 of state money to supplement the funds of the eleven communities offering junior college work.

In 1935 the first Junior-Senior College Conference was held at Mississippi State College at the invitation of the President, Dr. Duke Humphrey, now President of the University of Wyoming. This conference, which now includes the private and public junior and senior colleges of the state, has contributed much toward the understanding and harmonious relations among all segments of higher education in Mississippi.

During the summer of 1940, some 30 persons participated in a six-weeks' workshop solely for Mississippi junior college teachers. This workshop preceded by one year the Terminal Education Workshops co-sponsored by this Association. It is believed that this Mississippi innovation, held on the Peabody College Campus, was the first workshop ever conducted solely for junior college teachers. Consultants included such eminent leaders as Dr. Doak Campbell, Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, and Dr. J. Hooper Wise of the University of Florida.

In 1942 the Mississippi legislature made a special appropriation of \$60,000 for

vocational-technical training in junior colleges. This small appropriation gave real impetus to a greatly neglected phase of the program that had been written into the original 1928 law, which read in part: "These courses shall consist of the mechanical arts such as carpentry, masonry, painting, shopwork in iron and wood, and repairing and constructing motor vehicles." This was 1928. The program today is on a technical level.

That the state system of public junior colleges has won the favor of the people is established by the fact that the current state appropriation for the regular program is \$2,288,350 or \$229 per academic student, and the special appropriation for the vocational-technical program is \$541,650 or \$237 per student. In addition, during the last few years each junior college has been allocated \$310,000 of state funds for building and repair.

Mississippi's progress can be largely attributed to the fact that in the very beginning of the development a state system was established and a plan of "Birth Control" was determined. The system now includes three junior colleges for Negroes, which share in all state appropriations on the same basis as the white colleges. Although we have a state system regulated by the Junior College Commission, the administration and control of each college rests entirely with a local board of trustees. While the state appropriation of \$230 per student is reasonably generous, the primary source of the operational budget is derived from a local ad valorem tax levy on the junior college district. The districts vary in size from two counties to nine counties, with the exception of Meridian Municipal Junior Col-

lege, which is a part of the local city school system.

Thirteen of Mississippi's public junior colleges are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; this is *prima facie* evidence of their academic standing. The success of the modernized vocational-technical program is evinced by the demand for junior college trainees in the phenomenal industrialization expansion in the state. We already have a system of Area Vocational and Trade Schools. We are certain that what has happened in Mississippi has been duplicated on an even broader scale throughout the nation.

Now, as the American junior college faces the future, it appears to be limited only by our vision, our initiative, and our ability to gain complete acceptance by those who control the philanthropic and tax purse strings of the nation. Our present is ever brightening by the superior work being done at the national level by Jesse Bogue and Dr. Edmund Gleazer. One year ago in New York the Board of Directors authorized your president to appoint a committee to consider launching a Public Relations Project. Dr. Curtis Bishop, Chairman, Dr. Thomas Spragens, and Dr. John Lounsbury were appointed from the general membership, and Dr. Ralph Lee, Dr. Raymond Wass, and Dr. Edmund Gleazer were appointed to represent the Board of Directors.

This committee brought a report to the summer meeting of the Board. The report indicated that the minimum pledge of \$20,000 had been subscribed and the Special Committee presented a "Plan of Action." The Board authorized your president to appoint a Director for the Public Information Project, and indicated Ed

Gleazer as the first choice for the position. Incidentally, Dr. Gleazer was in Europe at the time of the Board meeting and unable to attend. Ed is in the temporary service of the Board of Directors who administers this position as it does other Association affairs through the Executive Secretary.

Even though this Public Information Project was initiated by the Independent Junior Colleges at the New York meeting, it also bids fair to be of inestimable value to the public colleges. Both types of institutions have contributed to the project through finance and leadership. Ed has made many valuable contacts, of which he will tell you. This Public Information Project may be labeled as an important "coats-off" to the job ahead.

As we face our stupendous tasks of today and tomorrow we shall need vision, initiative, courage, and a tremendous amount of common sense. Each individual junior college or community college, in the future as in the past, must find its place of service and plan its program in terms of the needs of its own community or area of service. For some it will be a continuation of the liberal arts—university preparatory program; for some it will be primarily a terminal program; but for the vast majority it will be a combination of the two.

Since our inception, we have claimed for ourselves the privilege of independence and the right to set our own pattern. We have but to examine curriculum offerings, read the public press and the *Newsletter* to know of the daring innovations that are taking place in almost every state. We must continue this pioneering spirit.

Others during this convention will

present the unusual and even revolutionary tasks and methods of accomplishment that are being, and will be, undertaken by colleges throughout the nation. I should like to bring to your attention some of the commonplace tasks that face us during the years immediately ahead. In making these statements it is recognized that each college will fulfill its responsibility within the realm of its own philosophy.

1. The keynote address to be delivered later this morning by Dean Stahr will give us a picture of the additional multitudes of young men and young women who will knock at college doors. As the predicted two million additional potential college students seek admission during the next ten years, many institutions will become highly selective. It is our responsibility to see that each young person who can profit by training beyond the high school has that opportunity. We must keep higher education democratic. Remember, many of us might never have received a college degree if only the intellectually elite had been admitted in our day.
2. To meet the need for 200,000 new public school teachers each year, we should systematically seek out high caliber teaching prospects and by careful guidance give them every encouragement to prepare for the teaching field.
3. Our ever expanding industrialization will demand hundreds of thousands of

men and women trained in technology. Most of this demand can and must be met by the junior and community colleges.

4. The financial burden of providing a college education will reach an astronomical figure. We must constantly seek ways and means of making the tax and the philanthropic dollar provide the most education possible without lowering standards.
5. Each junior college student is entitled to the personality development that can come only from a close faculty-student relationship. We must retain this personal interest in our students.
6. The scientists as well as the religionists are rightly concerned that man does not allow his mastery of the Creator's natural laws to destroy our civilization. We must assume a responsibility for inculcating high moral and spiritual values in the hearts and lives of our students, "for what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?"

Since September 1, 1956, my job has been outside the immediate field of the junior college. May I assure you that I am now, and ever shall be, a junior college supporter. I share with you the pardonable pride of our illustrious past. May the Master Teacher richly bless you as, "with-coats-off," you face the challenge of the momentous tasks of the years ahead.

Greeting to Junior Colleges

GEORGE D. CLYDE

IT GIVES me the greatest pleasure to welcome to Utah this distinguished delegation of representatives of more than 600 junior colleges in all parts of the nation. Utah is honored to act as host to the Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges. At the same time, I think it is not inappropriate that this state has been selected as the site of your meeting in this critical year when so many momentous problems are confronting American education.

Utah has a long and proud tradition in education. I may even say this tradition began before there was a state of Utah, or a Territory of Deseret, as this area was known in the early days of its permanent white settlement. The Mormon pioneers, as they wended their difficult way across the nation in the epic journey that terminated here in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, were deeply devoted to the ideals of education. Neither exhausting toil, nor the perils of the long journey through the wilderness, nor the violent persecutions to which they were so long subjected because of their beliefs could distract these dedicated people from the determination that their children should be educated.

In their earlier settlements in Kirtland, in Nauvoo, and in Far West, the pioneers

had established schools. Throughout the tortuous journey across the plains, they organized school classes around the campfires at night.

When they did arrive at their final destination in July of 1847, their thinking was again clearly evidenced by their actions. The first construction was a fort, for protection against the Indians. The next permanent construction was a place of worship, and the very next priority was a school building. The Mary Jane Dilworth School was in operation less than two weeks after the pioneers arrived in this valley.

The organization of a school, when so much energy was required to protect the very lives of the people and to wrest a crop from the soil in the short growing season that remained in the year, furnished a dramatic example of the high value placed on education by the people of this state. Further evidence is offered by the fact that within three years the University of Deseret, now the University of Utah, had been established.

Over the intervening years, Utah and Utahans have never lost their feeling that education is of the utmost importance. Utah ranks well above the national average in the number of school pupils per unit of population and in the number of students who complete their high school education. When it comes to edu-

GEORGE D. CLYDE is Governor of the State of Utah.

cation beyond the high school, Utah's position is still more impressive:

In 1953, latest year for which the United States Office of Education has published statistics, per 10,000 population, Utah had 283.6 in institutions of higher learning, compared to a national average of 139. The Utah figure is more than double the national average, and it places Utah first among the states in this category—a distinction of which we are very proud.

We are a state of traditionally large families, and our educational standards have not been achieved and maintained without a substantial element of financial sacrifice. Our per capita expenditure for education is high above the national average, and according to figures published last month in the *New York Times*, it stands first of all the states in per capita expenditure for higher education—\$21.67 as compared with the national average of \$9.15—and in the percentage of total state income spent for higher education—17.2 per cent as compared with the average of 8.5.

This state, like other states, has been beset with the many problems that have grown out of the post-war increase in the birth rate. Our primary and secondary schools have been acutely overcrowded, and we are still trying to catch up with our requirements for classrooms and teachers.

Very shortly, as we all well know, the increased enrollment that has taxed our elementary and high school facilities will be at the doors of our institutions of higher learning. It is important that we plan now if we are to meet this problem effectively when the full weight of its impact comes to bear. In planning and

meeting the problem, junior colleges are going to play an important role, here in Utah as elsewhere across the country.

Junior colleges have long rendered an important service to our educational system and our way of life, but I believe their full possibilities have never been generally recognized and utilized. In the years ahead, it is imperative that they be fully utilized if we are to meet the growing demand for post-high school education and stay within our means.

It will not only be far less expensive to build and maintain a reasonable system of junior colleges than to expand a few four-year institutions to double or triple their present size, it will—to my way of thinking at least—be more effective. Without attempting to go deeply into the situation in this limited time, I may point out a few of the special advantages junior colleges have to offer:

They provide the first two years of the post-high school education that is so important. Many of our young people do not have the means, or perhaps the inclination, to complete a standard four-year college course, and are vitally concerned with getting two years of what we might term semi-professional education beyond the high school. And many who do go to junior college decide to go further and transfer their credits to a four-year institution.

Smaller institutions offer a much more personalized type of teaching than do immense universities, and this is particularly important in the first year or so of college, when many students are somewhat bewildered and have a hard time "finding" themselves.

Junior colleges offer post-high school educational opportunities closer to home

for most students. That this is an important factor is shown by an Illinois study which discovered that 53.5 per cent of high school graduates continued their education when there was a junior college in their community, compared to only 19.7 per cent who went on to college when there was not. Junior colleges are particularly sensitive to the special needs of their own communities and areas and can do an important job of integrating industry's demands for specialized skills and services and the need of young people for suitable careers.

I could go on indefinitely—for this is a subject very close to my heart. But this

is supposed to be a word of greeting and not a major address—and I know you have a full schedule in your meetings here, as I have in my office at the capitol.

Again let me welcome you to Utah and wish you a most enjoyable and successful time in your meetings. We shall be watching with keen interest as you meet the problems confronting you in your present discussions and in the months and years ahead. We are looking to the junior colleges to provide a big part of the solution to our approaching problems in higher education, and we hope to contribute our share to the development of effective programs.

Your Theme—and The President's Committee

ELVIS J. STAHR, JR.

I COUNT it a signal honor to have been invited to keynote your convention this year. I am, of course, aware that the invitation was based not on my oratorical reputation but upon my position with the President's Committee, but I am honored nonetheless. Now that I am standing before you, however, and realize how inadequate my contribution is likely to be, I am reminded of one of my fellow-Kentuckian's favorite stories. Senator Barkley used to tell about the man who was being ridden out of town on a rail and, on being asked what he thought about it, said, "Well, if it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I'd just as soon walk!"

My feeling of inadequacy stems from the simple fact that probably every person in this room knows more about junior colleges than I do. It would be presumptuous indeed for me to pose as an expert, or, even if I were one, to try to tell you anything about your own business you don't already know. This is not to say, however, that I am not really interested in your business. I really came out here to learn rather than to instruct. But since this particular speech is the excuse for my presence, I thought I might use it primarily to tell you about something I *do* know a little about and in which I believe you to be interested and that is the President's Com-

mittee on Education Beyond the High School, for which I currently work. Even with that subject, I find myself a little like the mosquito in a nudist colony—I hardly know where to begin.

All of us here, I am confident, have a deep-rooted faith in education. We may not have quite the same faith as my filling-station attendant, who asked me one day, when I had stopped in for gas on the way to the airport, where I was going. I told him I was going to a big education convention. He thought about that a moment and then said, "You know, that education is fine stuff. If you ain't got it, you sho do have to use your brains!"

Our faith in education is shared in considerable measure by the American people. If only their belief in it were matched by their support of it, some of you educators' most discouraging problems would diminish quickly. But we're certainly far better off than if the American people did *not* believe in education! Quite clearly, too, their interest in education beyond the high school is growing. I know of no more dramatic evidence of this than the growth and vigor of the junior college movement in this country. This could not have come about without grassroots faith and support.

This phenomenon has aroused great interest on the part of the President's Committee—and I shall revert to that in a moment. But first let me tell you—or remind you—of some of the principal

ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., who delivered the keynote address at the AAJC Convention in Salt Lake City, is Executive Director of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Washington, D.C.

things about that committee and its program.

The following extract from President Eisenhower's Message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, succinctly states the mission of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

Our vision would be limited if we failed at this time to give special thought to education beyond the high school. Certain problems exist now in this field, and already we can foresee other needs and problems shaping up in the future. . . . Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the states, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond the high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop (this year) through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the nation, in the years ahead.

The committee was set up in the spring of 1956 and is composed of 35 members, about half educators and half laymen, representing all regions of the country as well as major interests in post-high school education.

The President's charge to the committee is a recognition of the need for an examination not only of the problems of what is ordinarily referred to as higher education, but also of the whole range of organized education beyond the high school. Therefore, educational services to adults, as well as the many other kinds of "noncollegiate" institutions and programs, are of concern to the committee.

It is clear from the President's charge that the committee has three tasks: first,

to find the salient facts and identify the major problems regarding post-high school education in the United States during the next 10 to 15 years and to "lay before" the American people these facts and problems; second, to stimulate "active" and "systematic attack" on the problems; and, third, to "develop, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field."

In approaching these tasks, the committee has assumed its goal to be to stimulate *action*. It has further assumed that this action must come from many people, agencies, institutions, and levels of government. To this end it has developed and is now carrying on two concurrent and inter-related lines of activity. Both are based on the concept that before there can be action, there must be planning; before planning, discussion; before discussion, concern and interest; and underlying all of these, information—the facts.

The first of these lines of activity is the work within the committee proper and its staff. The early meetings of the committee were devoted to a delineation of its major areas of concern and a consideration of what *kinds* of reports and proposals *this kind* of committee might most usefully aim toward. Studies were then initiated in four major areas, and subcommittees were formed to consider the facts and to identify the central principles and issues in each area. By October the full committee had agreed tentatively on a number of major premises, principles, problems, and issues, and statements of these were incorporated in the First Interim Report which was submitted to the President in November. I hope most of you have seen it. Dr. Bogue has brought some copies along for any who may not have, and I shall, therefore,

not attempt to summarize the report in these remarks.

In December, the full committee reorganized itself into three new subcommittees, and these are currently hard at work. Their respective areas of concern are: 1. problems from the student's point of view; 2. problems of resources from the institutions' point of view; and 3. problems of providing the needed diversity of educational opportunity beyond high school. These subcommittees are expected to report to the full committee this month and the committee hopes to publish a second report by June or July. In the meantime the staff is working on a sourcebook of facts for public use, and we are projecting a "casebook" of solutions.

The purpose of the First Interim Report was primarily to stimulate discussion and to get reactions and comments from as many people as practicable who have been particularly concerned with or interested in post-high school education. Hundreds of constructive letters have already been received, many of them from your membership; others are still coming in. These should help make the committee's next report a still better one! It is important to stress, however, that the committee's prime interest is *action* and not just the compiling of a report or reports that could easily gather dust. As the committee chairman, Mr. Devereaux C. Josephs, has said: "The road to inertia is paved with committee reports. We'd far rather produce an undistinguished report about which something was done than to produce a brilliant one about which nobody did anything."

You will note that the committee's approach is proceeding from interest and concern, which led to the appointment of the committee in the first place, to getting

the facts, which is a continuing process, to discussion and deliberation and invitation of suggestions, to planning; a final report which can be useful to the nation. The report is expected to focus upon major central problems rather than to be a compilation of everything under the sun that might be said about education beyond the high school. The committee itself can of course take no action other than submitting its reports and recommendations and stimulating others to discuss, plan and act. It is not an operating agency itself, and it is temporary. Its prime aim is to encourage laymen and educators throughout the country to work *together* on problems which neither group can effectively solve alone. The committee would like to build a slow fire which will be steadily increased in intensity during and especially after the committee's own life, rather than to make a big flash which might get everybody momentarily excited and then die out like a skyrocket.

To this end the second line of activity should contribute greatly. This line involves a sort of "chain reaction" which it is hoped in time will carry all the way into local communities around the nation. The elements of the chain are regional workshops, regional conferences, state conferences, state and local study and planning commissions, institutional planning and development programs, and general citizen understanding and support. The regional workshops were held last fall; they laid plans for the five regional conferences which will be held this spring; staff work is now going on in each region to assemble the facts and delineate the problems as they appear regionally, to provide bases for informal discussion at the conferences. I shall give you the dates,

places and other details of these conferences at the appropriate discussion sessions this afternoon. The regional conferences in turn will provide impetus and serve to suggest agenda and procedures for state conferences to be held this fall. The state meetings will also benefit from the regional conferences by being given a regional perspective of their state problems, which, as you are well aware, can rarely be viewed within the isolation of a state's boundaries. Both the regional and the state conferences will reflect back to the President's Committee the thinking of a great many able and interested people. So the "chain" should be well started by the time the committee makes its own final report not later than December 31 of this year.

But it's the follow-up that counts. Until the problems are solved, until appropriate opportunities for post-high school education are provided and adequately maintained—on a basis of equality of opportunity and in sufficient *quantity, quality, variety, and accessibility*—the job will not be finished. The committee recognizes that there are no *final* solutions and does not expect to propose any. It does believe that improvement and progress can be made. It also recognizes that many lines of attack are necessary.

Education beyond high school is an enormously varied thing in this country and undoubtedly will remain so. But it seems important for more and more teamwork, more and more joint planning and coordinated effort, to come about. Public and private institutions, state and local institutions, denominational and non-denominational institutions, two-year colleges and four-year colleges, universities,

professional and graduate schools, adult education programs, technical institutes, nurses schools, schools of commerce, schools of art and of music, trade schools, training in industry, training in the armed forces, extension programs and correspondence schools—governments, foundations, corporations, citizens and taxpayers—all these have parts to play in providing continuing opportunities for education. They should plan *together* more than they are accustomed to doing.

The nation cannot afford failure to provide these opportunities. It is important to our people, as free *individuals* to have opportunities to develop themselves throughout life, and it is imperative for the nation to have the kind of citizens and the quality of manpower that a self-governing, complex, technological, rapidly-developing society needs to survive, to be healthy, to be enlightened, to be cultured, and to be prosperous.

The simple fact is that our present educational resources are not sufficient either for the *people's* needs or for the *nation's* needs in the years ahead. We know all too well the implications for our schools of the increasing birthrates since 1939. Their impact has not yet struck institutions beyond high school but will begin to do so this year and will continue with mounting intensity each year thereafter. Yet our college enrollments were already, *last* year, the highest in our history at a time when our 18-29 age group was the smallest in 25 years. All this has obvious and most serious implications for the young people now in school—and for our country.

There are already great shortages in nearly every occupation which requires people with more than a high school education—shortages of teachers, of scientists,

of doctors, of engineers, of nurses, of technicians, of high-caliber executives, managers, administrators and leaders, in both public and private walks of life. I suggest that perhaps the most serious shortage of all is that of able teachers—at all levels of education and in nearly all fields of subject-matter—for teachers are the indispensable “seed corn” for all the rest.

But these shortages are also opportunities. The rising tide of youth makes certain that we will soon have the numerical manpower to do the work of our expanding society, but the big question is whether or not that manpower will be of the *quality* necessary. On the one hand, the need for common labor is steadily declining; on the other, the need and hence the career opportunities for men and women in the fields requiring more than twelve years of formal education is steadily growing.

There is another angle, a very basic one, and that is the need for a better educated citizenry in the leading nation in a troubled world. Education is the cornerstone of self government as we have long recognized. It is also the cornerstone of international understanding and intelligent world leadership.

All these things present a *challenge* to the American people—and our educational future should be approached as a challenge, rather than merely as a *problem*. But there are problems which must be solved if the challenge is to be met.

I said a moment ago that there are four essential characteristics of educational opportunities beyond high school which this nation must provide its people if the challenge of the future is to be met. These are quantity, quality, variety, and accessibility. I also said that the Presi-

dent's Committee has shown particularly keen interest in the two-year institution. I believe the relationship is clear. Viewed from an over-all perspective, our two-year institutions have demonstrated the potential for developing the combination of all four characteristics to an almost unique degree. In doing so they have also demonstrated the American genius for finding new ways of doing old jobs. For a time while preparing this talk, I thought of using a number of illustrations of this point which were given me by Dr. Bogue. He has told me about the really dramatic experiences in California, about the ingenious plan in Flint, about Little Rock, about many other imaginative developments. I've talked with members of our staff, with members of the President's Committee and with consultants who have special knowledge of two-year institutions. On the committee are not only Dr. Bethel, but also a member of the Chicago School Board which is now operating junior colleges, the president of a university which has a number of two-year branches, a professor who has made a special study of community colleges. There are others who are knowledgeable in this field. Our consultants have included more than one expert on two-year institutions. I've read interesting articles recently in *Good Housekeeping* and the *A.A.U.W. Bulletin*, to name only two; the study summarized in a recent issue of “Higher Education”; speeches by President Sproul and Superintendent Simpson of California. From all I can see from where I sit I would say that it could have been the junior college movement which inspired the slang expression, “The joint is really jumping!”

But it would take too long and be bringing coals to Newcastle for me to tell you all these things you already know. Certainly they illustrate that there's more than one way to skin a cat.

One thing I feel you would want me to stress. There are those who fear that whatever may be the advantages of junior colleges with regard to solving problems of quantity, variety, and accessibility, they can be offset by lack of quality. I get the impression that your organization is perfectly aware of this danger, and I am positive that this is a problem which is not limited to two-year colleges. Perhaps the most critical facet of the problem of quality for all types of institutions in the future is going to be the short supply of able teaching personnel. Attracting high grade teachers appears certain to become more and more difficult for the next five or maybe ten years. Even the *potential* supply will be short during that period—and the *actual* supply will be short long after that unless substantial steps are taken to increase the drawing power of the teaching profession. One thing that may help some two-year institutions would be to have or develop affiliations with universities. Another may be to work out exchange arrangements with other junior colleges. Certainly junior colleges will want to maintain truly college-level programs. I have a feeling that they may actually be able to do a better job of it than many universities which already rely too heavily on graduate assistants and inexperienced instructors in too many lower division courses. But there are always problems of attracting high caliber, experienced teachers to institutions with limited libraries and research programs. Perhaps you will have

to face a good deal of turnover in your facilities, but this need not be fatal if you keep recruiting bright, able, ambitious younger men and women and provide them an opportunity to get some years of solid experience in a respected academic environment at good pay.

I know these problems are receiving your most searching thought and analysis. I know that there is more than one approach to solution. I'll be deeply interested in what you come up with. All institutions, or nearly all, will be faced with problems of maintaining quality in the face of, and, I would add, for the *sake* of, mounting enrollments. Nothing but the best should be good enough. Our institutions of higher education, all of them, must have the finest teachers America can develop, the best libraries, the most modern laboratories, the most serious students.

I may be wrong, but I seem to sense perhaps a greater eagerness on the part of our junior colleges than in many of our senior colleges to find and utilize more efficient and modern methods of management, space utilization, curricular organization and so on—and more willingness to seek new means of making the teacher more effective. The heavy weight of tradition seems less inhibiting. This can be health. It is well to hold fast to that which is good, but honest educators know that not all they do is perfect.

May I close with this thought: It is in our colleges that students must learn the significance of the fact that after high school there is no compulsion but there is great opportunity; that their continuing education is their own responsibility; that society cannot teach them, *they* must *learn*; that society can

provide the opportunities, the facilities and the teachers but the motivation must come from within.

But let us all work *together* to insure that when we do talk to our young people of any age or family background about the educational opportunities that lie ahead of them, those opportunities will be there, will be worthy of the greatest, wealthiest nation in the history of the world and will be *available to them*. *That* is the challenge of the future.

Many people have overlooked it, but we've doubled college enrollments in the past 15 years and developed more and better institutions than ever in the process. The junior colleges have played a great part in this dramatic accomplishment. Hats off to the past! Now we must double *again* in the next 15 years—and do a better job still! I predict that the junior colleges will play the starring role in this future drama.

Coats off to the future!

The Role of College Education in a Free Society

FRANK CHURCH

THE GENERAL theme of my address is the role of college education in a free society. For the discussion of this subject I have, of course, no *professional* qualifications. I cannot speak to you as an educator. My profession is law, and my career is, at present, that of a United States Senator. Senators these days are sometimes concerned about education, just as educators are sometimes concerned about senators. The overriding concern of both ought to be an educational system that will nourish and safeguard freedom in our land.

The stark, central fact about the world today is that it is split into two parts, half slave and half free. To state it so is not to speak idly. In essence, one half is dedicated to personal freedom; the other half subordinates personal freedom to the demands of the state. It is abundantly clear that in the Communist half of the world tyranny, in the sense of the cruel and arbitrary exercise of despotic power, is in fact deeply entrenched. In our half, while personal freedom under law is by no means the universal reality, it is the dominant objective.

Tyranny, of course, is not new to the world. Our forebearers have suffered under it in one form or another and have contended against it at one time or

another for centuries. But never was there a time when tyranny presented so mortal a threat to freedom as now. The ancient tyrant rested his rule on spear-points; yesterday's tyrant depended on muskets; today's tyrant has all the awesome weapons of modern technology at his command. In the time of our own Revolution—and in the time of the French Revolution—it was still possible for a people to organize against a tyrant, arm themselves with small arms, and take possession of half a country even before news of the revolt reached the Crown. In those times, it was still possible for the farmer and the merchant to seize a rifle, join a citizens' army, and fight against the tyrant's troops on somewhat equal terms. This kind of revolution has been a part of our Western tradition, and it has become a part of our concept, taught to us in our classrooms and accepted by most of us almost as an article of faith, that people oppressed by tyranny will not endure it long but will rise in revolt against it and break its yoke. Truth, we are fond of saying, once crushed to earth, will rise again!

I think that the time has come when we must re-examine this premise. Only months ago we watched a gallant Hungarian people fight desperately for freedom, but vainly did they die. For years we have witnessed brave workers behind the Iron Curtain engage in futile revolt

FRANK CHURCH, United States Senator from Idaho, gave this address at the Annual Dinner and General Session of the AAJC Convention in Salt Lake City, March 8, 1957.

against hated Communist rule. In Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, in 1953 the workers took possession of the great Skoda munitions plant and then extended their control to the entire city. When the puppet police were ordered to fire, they would not. When the puppet troops were ordered to march, they refused. But Russian tanks crushed the revolt swiftly and surely.

We remember in the same year the uprising of the workers in East Berlin. Who can forget the photographs that were taken then of men fighting in the streets, so fearless in their dedication that they met the Russian tanks in the open, armed with the only weapons they could find—the bricks and stones of the broken buildings!

Lest you say that I dramatize too much, and that I point, for illustration, to captive peoples in little countries living under the boot of the Russian Goliath, let me remind you of a very different case in point, which, I believe, will even better illustrate my argument—the case of Nazi Germany, familiar to us all.

Hitler was a modern tyrant whose power to retain the reins of government was surely put to the ultimate test. He achieved control of Germany without ever having won majority support. Once Chancellor, he arrogated to himself dictatorial powers and crushed all opposition to his rule. He ordered Germany into a war that was not, even in the beginning, popular with his people. After the blitzkrieg victories, the war became a hopeless stalemate. Inexorably, the tide of battle turned; Germany was bled white on the battlefields of Europe; her armies were destroyed in Africa; her major ally, Italy, tottered and collapsed before the invading allied armies, and Hitler's partner,

the Sawdust Caesar, was shot down in the streets of Milan and hung by his boots for the crowds to revile. Two years before the war ended, it had become clear that there was no possible way for Germany to win. Yet, the German tyrant, thought mad by members of his own high command, continued doggedly to hold control. Hitler was dictator, and Hitler remained dictator while his armies, bludgeoned and beaten, retreated back toward the capital. Hitler was dictator, and Hitler remained dictator while the great cities of Germany were pounded into rubble by massive fleets of bombers against which there was no shield. There was no place to hide. There was no way to win. And sane men, many of whom held high positions in the army and in the government, conspired together in an effort to stop the bloodshed by deposing Adolph Hitler. But Hitler was dictator, and Hitler remained dictator until there was nothing left of Germany but the black and twisted ruins of Berlin. Germany stopped fighting when Hitler stopped living, his life taken by his own hand in a bunker under the rubble of his smashed chancery. I saw what was left of that chancery when I was in Berlin a year ago. It is just a pile of broken stone and masonry, a fitting monument to the memory of Adolph Hitler.

The point I make, my friends, is this: Modern tyranny, once it takes possession of a people, has the implements with which it can preserve its power indefinitely. It has armored divisions and highly mobile troops for swift dispatch into any corner of the country where trouble brews. It has secret police who mix constantly with the people and who, by wire or wireless, can instantly apprise the capitol of any planned uprising long be-

fore it can be effectively launched. What's worse still is that modern tyranny has the means with which to remold the minds of the people. The newspapers, the magazines, the radio, and television programs can be so efficiently censored and directed by the tyrant, the schools and universities can be so rigidly disciplined, that the people can be taught, in time, to accept what the state directs and to forget what the truth may be. Never before in all the history of the world has a tyrant commanded any tools to compare with those he can now possess. Never before could a people be so completely captured and controlled. This is why I say with the deepest conviction that we must not let the tyranny of our times engulf what is left of the free world. For if tyranny triumphs throughout the world at large, it will plunge mankind into an age of darkness that could last a thousand years.

What, then, is the challenge facing the educators of America? What is the role that education should play in keeping our country free? One role is plain. Education should contribute to our military security. Everyone agrees that our schools should furnish us with the trained technicians we need to fill the requirements of our industry and the necessities of our defense. In recent weeks, I have listened to many of my colleagues in the Senate warn the nation about the immense number of trained technicians being graduated each year from Russian universities. Several bills have already been introduced to give federal financial assistance to qualified students in our own colleges who seek degrees in the sciences. As long as our freedom is threatened by possible conquest from without, who will quarrel with the urgency of the mission of our schools to

supply us with the physicists, chemists, engineers, and technicians we must have to keep our military defenses strong? I neither question this mission nor belittle its importance.

Yet, it could easily be a fatal mistake for us to assume that the principal threat to our freedom today lies in the possibility of military conquest from without. I don't believe that it does. I suggest to you that the greatest totalitarian triumphs of the twentieth century have come from within the countries fallen victim. This was so in the case of the Communist seizure in Russia and in China; this was so in the case of the Fascist seizures in Germany, Italy, Spain, and Japan. The threat to freedom is authoritarian government. It matters not whether that government owns all the factories, as in a Communist state, or whether it owns only the public buildings and the military forces, as in a Fascist state. Freedom can be totally extinguished one way or the other:

Now I think we have been alerted to the Communist method of subversion and revolution from within. Certainly we should be by now! Every day it is being dramatized anew in our newspapers and magazines and on radio and television programs. The method involves all of the conventional techniques of espionage, conspiracy, and intrigue. This kind of Communist threat is one that we can readily identify and understand. Thus we can safeguard ourselves against it. I think it noteworthy that Communist subversion and revolt from within has worked only in countries like Russia and China where the established governments were weak and inept and where the people at large were cursed with ignorance and poverty. The United States, richest and

most powerful country of the world, presents just the opposite case. No, my friends, I have long been convinced that the greatest potential danger to freedom within our land does not lurk beneath a Red Flag that we can all recognize and tear down. I have too much faith in the inherent health and sturdiness of my country to believe that a few fanatics serving an alien cause can steal from us our freedom. They may indeed do mischief. We should take every precaution consistent with the methods of a free society to protect ourselves against them. But those who serve the Red Flag within this country are far removed from any real power in our political life. Every American who retained his perspective through the storm of "McCarthyism" we have just weathered, or who has regained his perspective since, knows that this is true.

The greatest potential danger to freedom within our land, I submit, rests not in alien hands but in our own. If we lack good judgment—and these turbulent times will tax our judgment to its limits—we have the power in our own hands to destroy freedom in the name of defending it! Misguided but zealous patriots waving the Stars and Stripes could, without meaning to do so, expand into a political force of such dimension as to trample freedom underfoot. This is how tyranny has come in our own lifetimes to enlightened and progressive countries not so unlike our own.

A year ago I was in Munich talking to a German who had supported Hitler in the early days. He was appalled at what had happened to Germany after the Nazis took control. When I asked him why he had been drawn to Hitler at the crucial

time when the people still could have stopped him, he gave me a simple, truthful explanation I won't forget. He said, "Hitler was for Germany. He was the most pro-German politician I had ever listened to. I didn't understand what freedom really was. Hitler said he would protect it and make Germany pure and strong. He said our ills were due to the traitors among us—the Jews and the Communists. He promised to rid us of these enemies. He was for Germany. I didn't understand!"

Ask me what the primary purpose of education is in a free society, and I will tell you it is this: It is to teach the people to understand. It is to teach the people the real meaning of freedom, for it is a complex concept to master, not a simple one. It is to equip the people to govern themselves, for govern they must! It is to charge them, at least at the college level where the most significant learning must occur, with a meaningful acquaintance with the history of our civilization, with the nature of free government under law, and with a general knowledge sufficiently broad to enable them to discharge intelligently their responsibilities as free citizens.

I am aware that there is nothing novel in the doctrine that college students should receive a liberal education in the humanities and in the social sciences. Despite all the pressures to which modern education is subject, the place of these disciplines in the curriculum has been ably defined. Sometimes, however, an outsider, from his different perspective, can make profitable suggestions for the attainment of an agreed objective. Looking at our college system from the point of view of a layman, but one who has had fairly

recent experience with it, I wish now to suggest some ways in which it seems to me that the colleges can improve their implementation of the philosophy that the great thoughts and fruitful experiences of Western civilization must, in the interest of freedom, be transmitted intact to each new generation.

First, it occurs to me that it ought not to be taken for granted that the entering college freshman is aware of the significance to him of the non-technical courses he will be required or encouraged to take. Perhaps a little deliberate indoctrination is in order. The scientific world has its own proud philosophy, and most high school people are exposed to it in the person of competent and dedicated high school teachers of science. They have been taught to respect facts and the empirical method of identifying, classifying, and applying them. They have already experienced the satisfaction of testing textbook propositions for themselves in the laboratory. That which they have thus verified for themselves, they have learned to respect. Many of them, I am afraid, have no such respect for the methods of the humanities and social studies.

It seems to me that a freshman survey course in which the philosophy and rationale of the humanities and the social studies are developed from first principles might properly be required of all college freshmen. From this course, they should gain an appreciation of the role of the humanities in nurturing the capacity to live happily and well. They should gain some insight into the relationship between the social studies and the fulfillment of responsible citizenship and a free society. Above all, they should be started, at least, on the road to an appreciation of the fact

that an educated person must always be, by definition, a foe of intolerance and bigotry, an effective fighter for freedom and a capacious vessel for the reception of ideas. They should be apprised that the basic problems of human relations are the most subtle, the most baffling, and at the same time, the most challenging problems that the human intellect can assault.

Second, I think college administrators and faculties should be alert to defend and promote the prestige of the humanities and the social studies. First impressions cut deep, and even the physical environment in which a class is taught can affect the student's evaluation of its importance. I remember well, in this connection, the first philosophy course I attended at Stanford. This much-abused department of learning, I think we can agree, is fundamental to anything that deserves the name of education. It deals with absolutely basic values, and it pursues them by means of the most rigorous intellectual discipline. I looked forward to my first class in philosophy with delighted anticipation. It was taught in a musty classroom in a decrepit corner of the campus. I soon learned that the entire philosophy department at that great university was staffed by two men and headed by an associate professor. In retrospect, it seems to me tragic, but not surprising, that those classes were not heavily attended.

Another aspect of the same problem has to do with faculty salaries and prestige. Most of you are doubtless painfully aware of the fact that it is difficult to employ competent teachers at the salary level available to most colleges. The difficulty is most acute, of course, in the sci-

entific field where the competition of industry is relentless. Now, a young man with a Ph.D. in philosophy, or English literature, has somewhat fewer alternatives to teaching than does a young doctor whose specialty is chemistry or nuclear physics. Under the economic pressures thus induced, many college administrators must be sorely tempted, even against their better judgment, to adopt a double standard of salaries for technical and non-technical teaching personnel. I say against their better judgment, for I am sure every good administrator recognizes that open or tacit discrimination in this regard will inevitably dry up the sources of good teachers in the down-graded fields. But the most destructive consequence is the inevitable communication to the students of the weakened morale of teachers who feel themselves under-rated.

Still another factor undermining the prestige of non-technical courses is the fact that they often seem too easy to justify or demand the best efforts of competent students. Students tend to accept the valuation of a course of study implicitly placed upon it by the instructor, and it is unhappily the case that attitudes toward, and methods of, teaching the humanities and social studies have sometimes failed to keep pace with the quality of scientific instruction. Add to these factors the authentic glamour which attaches, by reason of its dramatic achievements, particularly in the nuclear field, to all who don the cloak of science, and it is not surprising that many bright students approach the study of the humanities with impatience, if not with actual distaste.

Before leaving this point, let me suggest that where money is a problem (and isn't

it always?) we must avoid the pressure to skimp in the humanities. The preservation of freedom is at stake. Freedom is not the product of science. The Greeks had freedom. Indeed, the effectiveness of Nazi technology and the vitality and resourcefulness of Soviet science today demonstrate that science and tyranny are not necessarily incompatible. Freedom can live and grow only in intimate association with the humanities. Still speaking as a layman, I would say if sacrifices need be made then let's cut the frills—the cooking, dancing, marketing courses, yes, the swollen athletic programs, if need be—but do not trifle with the humanities, for to do so is to strike at freedom in its most vulnerable place.

Finally, I believe it is the responsibility of college administrators and faculties to resist to the utmost those who would isolate you from the mainstream of American life. Contempt for, and mistrust of, the intellectual has gone too far in this country. Survival in the atomic age does not lie in adulation of good-natured mediocrity, or in scorn for the bold creative thinking that comes from the disciplined minds concentrated in institutions of higher learning. I believe there is a growing distinction in this connection between the place of universities in the United States and the respected position enjoyed by their European counterparts. The young man who goes away to college with the preconception derived from the attitudes of his parents, from the public statements of successful businessmen and political leaders, and from the mass media of communication that what he will learn there is of no practical significance is simply being taught to look for the answers to the great questions of our time

in the newspapers rather than in the books and great minds he will encounter as he acquires his higher education.

During my recent political campaign in Idaho, I was eager to discuss the issues on college campuses before college students and faculties. Only at the private institutions were opportunities to do so available. Contrast this with the situation in England, where colleges and universities have traditionally been, and where they remain, the preferred forum for public debate of the great questions of the day.

While the relationship between the college and its community should be close and harmonious, I do not mean to suggest that the college should simply mirror the community. To the extent that it merely conforms, it will fail in its mission, which is to lift and to lead. Only the colleges and universities, the centers of creative original thought, can lift us to the level at which we can find solutions to the human problems of our age.

I began this consideration of the role of education in modern America by recalling that we live in a bifurcated world. I have emphasized that because one-half of that world is a tyranny equipped with

technology it represents for all of us a menace of unprecedented and terrifying proportions. I have suggested that a significant aspect of that menace lies in the fact that science, which creates the technology that lends new terror to modern tyranny, is not in itself incompatible with tyranny. I have stated my belief that the colleges and universities must do more than they are to make certain that in meeting the pressing demand to turn out competent scientists in ever increasing numbers they do not neglect, also, to turn out educated people equipped to discharge the responsibilities of citizenship in this perilous age.

Let me conclude with a truism that bears repeating no less often simply because it is true. The future of the world, *if we are lucky*, is now being determined in the classrooms. What happens to the mind and spirit of young men and women of college age is, I think, decisive in determining the level at which they will contribute to the preservation and the growth of the society into which they emerge.

Therefore, we who are not educators wish you well. It may be that our lives are in your hands.

Coats Off to the Future—Universities

JAMES W. REYNOLDS

THE PORTION of the convention slogan pertaining to this morning's program—"Coats Off to the Future"—applies to universities more as a description of a long-existing condition than an admonition. Their coats have been off for more than a century. As a matter of fact, representatives of universities were directly involved in the conception of the junior college idea and its subsequent birth as an infant institution.

Historians of the junior college movement invariably mention the names of Tappan of Michigan and Folwell of Minnesota as prominent forerunners of the development. While neither participated directly in establishing junior colleges, it must be acknowledged that their perspicacity and the prestige of their position enabled them to contribute materially to the popularization of the junior college idea.

Tappan and Folwell started their work near the mid-point of the nineteenth century. In the last decade of this same century William Rainey Harper became president of the newly organized University of Chicago. During his administration he introduced many innovations into the field of higher education among which was the recognition of junior and senior

college divisions in the college of the University, and strong influence in establishing separate junior colleges in such states as Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Texas.

Contemporary with and subsequent to the work of Harper at Chicago was the work of Lange at the University of California. His efforts together with those of Jordan at Stanford did much to stimulate the growth of the junior college movement in the state in which they worked.

The role of the pioneers in the development of junior colleges in the United States would not be complete if it omitted the names of Koos at Minnesota and Chicago, Eells at Stanford and Eby at Texas. The work of these three university faculty members is too well known to require elaboration.

The universities thus far named have had their coats off for a long time in the conception, birth, and childhood of the junior college movement. That movement, however, has long since reached adult status. In spite of this, the university coats are still off. Originally, this abbreviated apparel facilitated their work as parent and mentor. Today, it facilitates their cooperative attack with the junior colleges on the persistent problems of higher education.

Evidence of this continued work may be observed in considering only a few of the university representatives actively engaged in working with junior colleges: This list

JAMES W. REYNOLDS is Professor of Junior College Education, The University of Texas, Austin, and Editor of the *Junior College Journal*.

includes such persons as Basler at Peabody, Grace Bird of the University of California, and Black at Kansas State Teachers College in Pittsburg. Then there is Loren Brown of the University of Oklahoma, Bill Carpenter at Missouri, and C. C. Colvert at the University of Texas. Additionally there is Crawford at Washington State College, Fields at Teachers College, Henderson at the University of Florida, and Johnson at U.C.L.A. Still others include Lichty at Illinois State Normal University, Keller at Minnesota, and one might even be induced to add the name of one Reynolds at the University of Texas. This list is obviously incomplete. Its purpose, however, was to illustrate the fact that the university coat is still off. Recent developments at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, to mention only two, indicate that the ranks of university workers are being augmented.

One interesting characteristic of the present group of university workers who have peeled down to their shirt sleeves is the fact that many have had actual experience in junior colleges. In the preceding list, for example, one observes that Basler worked at Joliet, Grace Bird at Bakersfield, Black at Arkansas City and Pueblo, Brown at Northern Oklahoma, Carpenter at Phoenix, Colvert at Central and Northeast Louisiana, Crawford at Dodge City, Johnson at Stephens, and Reynolds at Fort Smith. Others have had experiences in other junior colleges. These experiences have enabled many present-day university representatives to have first-hand knowledge of the problems with which their colleagues in the junior college field are working.

The discussion of the junior college movement in this country has depended

thus far on the similarity of this development to the earlier stages of the life cycle. We have considered the period of conception, birth, and childhood. The selection of this analogy was deliberate. It is believed that it provides the best medium for describing the relationship of the junior colleges and the universities in the past. This relationship has progressed from that of the adult supervising the child to one of cooperation among adults.

The period of childhood for the junior college movement was replete with all the problems the child had to master before he reached adult status. For example, there was the problem of establishing understandings with four-year colleges and universities in the matter of transfer of credits. This problem was tied in intimately with that of securing recognition from accrediting associations. A third problem existed in finding an answer to the question of what the role of the junior college was to be. Finally, public junior colleges faced the serious problem of securing legislative sanctions for their very existence.

There is no disposition to assert that all of these problems have reached their final solution. Evidence exists in ample amounts, however, to indicate that the problems associated with junior college-university relations have been solved in the main. Perhaps the proof of this fact can be found nowhere in greater degree than the atmosphere that pervades the Annual Meetings.

The first such meeting attended by your speaker was in Dallas in 1937. He well recalls that junior college-university relationships were discussed with the type of reverence and awe that might characterize a young child's consideration of

a stern, unsympathetic adult. There was present in the atmosphere both the brashness of the adolescent dealing lightly with an adult when he is sure the adult is not listening, and the "proper respect" manifested when there is a possibility that what he says or does will reach the ears or eyes of this same adult. These typically adolescent characteristics have long since disappeared from the Annual Meetings.

It is important to acknowledge this change in relationship before describing in greater detail junior college-university activities of the present or the future. By such acknowledgement, the relations appear in the perspective that exists—relations of two segments of the field of higher education motivated by an equal desire to solve the persistent problems that face institutions dedicated to the purpose of satisfying educational needs of boys and girls and men and women of the United States.

It was pointed out earlier in this paper that the coats of the universities of this country have been off for more than a century insofar as junior colleges are concerned, and that there is no indication that these coats are being put back on. Evidence to support the contention that the work of the universities and four-year colleges is continuing is based on a modest questionnaire study made in connection with this paper.

Inquiries were sent to 150 colleges and universities from which 115 replies were received. Four items of information were requested: (1) "Do you provide through regularly planned aspects of your program any professional services for junior colleges"; (2) "If answer is 'Yes,' please indicate on the checklist the services in

which you are currently engaged or have been engaged in the past two years"; a checklist was included containing the following items: formal courses, workshops, consultant work, short conferences on your campus, short conferences on a junior college campus, extension classes, and the inevitable item, "other"; (3) a list of the names of the person or persons who provide the service, and (4) the titles of any formal courses that are offered.

There is no intention of claiming that the respondents to this questionnaire constitute a representative sample of the colleges and universities of the nation since the original selection was not made with this factor in mind. That the respondents do constitute a fair cross-section, however, is indicated by the fact that they are located in 41 states, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii. This should lend credence to the significance of the findings.

Forty-five of the 115 colleges and universities responding stated that they provide such professional services. These institutions are located in 22 states and their cross-sectional status is indicated by the fact that there is at least one state represented in each of the major geographical divisions of the country.

Another questionnaire was sent to 200 junior colleges. While it will be discussed in detail subsequently in this paper, reference is made at this point because it yielded the names of 36 additional colleges and universities not included in the preceding figure of 45. Thus, the study provided information that 81 of the nation's colleges and universities are engaged in professional services for junior colleges, and obviously this is not in any sense a complete figure.

For the sake of clarity, the nature of the professional service provided by colleges and universities will be divided into two sections: those services reported by senior institutions, and those reported by the junior colleges. In the first category, the report is based on the replies from the 45 institutions previously identified.

Twenty-eight of the 45 colleges and universities stated they offer formal courses pertaining to the junior college. The number of such courses ranges from fifteen in one institution to three institutions in which only a single course is offered. The most popular course on the basis of the frequency of offering is one entitled, "The Junior College" or "The Community College." This course is offered in 20 colleges or universities. Next in popularity is a course dealing with the junior college curriculum. This was listed by seven schools. Other frequently offered courses identified by the nature of the course since the titles vary are: administration, six institutions; internship, five; adult education, three; and student personnel, two.

Reports from the several colleges and universities which listed formal courses dealing with the junior college indicate that while some such courses are specifically planned for this segment of higher education, others deal generally with the field of higher education and relate to the junior colleges on the basis of their being a part of the broad area. In such courses, there is no way of telling from the title just how much consideration is given to strictly junior college topics.

Workshops were reported by 17 of the colleges and universities as included in their program of professional services for junior colleges. Twenty-two institutions

stated they conducted short conferences for junior colleges on their campus, and ten colleges and universities conduct short conferences on the junior college campus. It was recognized that there may be material overlap in these classifications of services, so that the information is not as definitive as that concerning the offering of formal courses. It is believed, however, that the incidence of such activities regardless of the overlap is significant to an understanding of what is being done.

Fourteen colleges and universities listed the offering of extension courses as one of the professional services they provided to junior colleges. Information received from the questionnaire to junior colleges suggests that this service exists in one of two forms. In some cases, the extension courses are offered for enrollees restricted to members of the junior college staff. In other instances, the college or university merely uses the junior college facilities for offerings in their general extension program. This latter could be considered to be a professional service to the junior college in that it amounts to an expansion of the program of offerings of the institution. One junior college reported that it served as a coordinating agent for the extension courses of several senior institutions.

The most frequently provided professional service is that of consultation. Thirty-two of the 45 institutions reporting programs list this form of service. The range of subjects covered by these consultative aids will be described in detail in the portion of this paper which treats with the junior college questionnaire.

One aspect of the consultation service leads to the conclusion that actually more colleges and universities are providing such assistance than these institutions real-

ize. In listing the professional services which junior colleges stated were being provided to them by specific colleges or universities, it was found that 14 institutions were included that had denied offering any service. Almost invariably, the nature of the service was in the form of consultation. The explanation for this apparent contradiction probably will be found in the probability that individual staff members have consulted with junior college administrators unbeknownst to the college or university with which they are associated. Thus a member of the architecture faculty might help a junior college administrator with a problem of building design and the fact never reach the attention of the president of the university. To the extent that this situation exists, the original list of 76 colleges and universities would have to be extended.

The last item in the checklist, as was previously noted, was denoted, "other." It was, as is always the case, included as a catchall category to elicit responses that could not be subsumed under the regular headings. As was anticipated, the bait did not catch many fish. A few of the responses under this heading, however, are sufficiently interesting to deserve mention.

The respondent at the University of Florida cited the case of the two-year study in that state made by the Florida Community College Council under the direction of James Wattenbarger, a faculty member, who was given a leave of absence to do the work. Grace Bird in replying for the University of California called attention to the permanent Office of Relations with Schools of which she is Associate Director and Herman Spindt is Director. Irvin Coyle of the University of Missouri described the regular accredita-

tion service which is provided for both public and private junior colleges in that state. Several universities publish bulletins of varying degree of detail intended to help solve many of the problems which arise over the status of parallel courses. The University of Texas is currently using a course entitled, "Community Services of the Junior College," as a means of a field study of the sociological and psychological processes encountered in a community service program.

The staff members of the college or university to whom the questionnaires were sent were asked to name the person or persons responsible for the professional services provided to junior colleges. A total of 67 names were listed. In addition, some institutions listed the office or officer responsible for the services, and three respondents named neither an individual nor an officer. In the junior college questionnaire, a total of 99 names were listed, none duplicating the 67 already accounted for. Thus, on the basis of the two questionnaires, a total of 166 persons were named who have represented colleges or universities in working on the professional problems of junior colleges.

It should not be assumed that even a majority of these persons listed have any particular competence which would be associated with unique needs of junior colleges. The fact that they were used, however, indicates the common nature of many of the problems of the junior colleges with those of four-year colleges and universities. This is in direct line with the suggestion made earlier in this paper that the relationship between these two types of institutions is on a friendly basis due to the fact that all are cooperating to solve the problems of providing higher educa-

tion for the youth and adults of this country.

Have the universities put their coats back on after their work with junior colleges in the past? On the basis of the activities reported by approximately 40 per cent of the 115 institutions which responded to the questionnaire, it would seem that they are as active as ever. When one considers that some of the replies from institutions which reported no service currently, but making plans to initiate such a program—when these replies are taken into consideration—it becomes obvious that the coats off policy is being extended rather than being abandoned. What do the junior colleges themselves report? The answer to this question will now be presented.

Questionnaires were sent out to 200 junior colleges and replies were received from 160. Two items of information were requested from these institutions: (1) "Have you or your staff received any professional service from any college or university during the last two years?" and (2) "If answer is 'Yes' please indicate the nature of the service on the following chart." A chart was then appended with three columnar headings: (1) "Service," (2) "College or University," and (3) "Person Providing Service." A sample entry was listed under the headings to make the request clearer.

As with the questionnaire to the colleges and universities, no attempt was made to secure a representative sample. Despite this, however, replies were received from junior colleges in 42 states, Canada, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. Also, as with the other questionnaires described, respondents came from each of the major geographical divisions of the United

States. Ninety-one of the respondents were public junior colleges and 69 were private. Thus, while no claim is made as to the sample being representative, at least it represents a satisfactory cross-section of these institutions.

Sixty-four of the junior colleges who responded to the request reported having received some sort of professional service from colleges and universities. This, coincidentally, is about the same percentage as that of the colleges and universities which reported providing such services. The percentage of colleges and universities was 39; for the junior colleges—40.

Several attempts were made to relate the incidence of use of services by the junior colleges to some factor. It was found for example that 44 per cent of the public junior colleges made such use, while only 36 per cent of the private institutions did. The lack of representativeness of the sample, however, made the significance of a difference no greater than this highly questionable. An analysis of the incidence of use by geographical location revealed nothing that could serve as a basis for a reliable conclusion. It was found, for example, that only in the East North Central Section of the country did the number of junior colleges using such service exceed the number that did not. When an attempt was made to interpret this fact no variable could be found which was so unique in this section as to serve as a satisfactory explanation. As a result of such failures to find any decided pattern of use or lack of use further analysis of this type was abandoned.

The problem of presenting in an intelligible way the diffuse responses of the junior colleges is a difficult one. It was finally decided that perhaps a summary

could be devised under two main divisions. The first division will include the form the services took, as workshops, and others. The second division will concern itself with the field of junior college activity involved in the service, as administration, student personnel, and the like. The listings under each heading are intended to be illustrative and in no way constitute an exhaustive enumeration.

Eighteen forms for providing professional services to the junior colleges were identified from the answers of the respondents. These include: short courses, workshop for faculty, public speeches in behalf of junior colleges, consultation, conferences including those conducted in the period immediately preceding the opening of the school year, visit of evaluation teams, survey of community conducted by a university, reports and publications, examination of candidates for permanent positions, extension class for junior college faculty, inservice training, library service, administering testing program, faculty counseling, reviewing plans, seminar, providing speakers and entertainment for junior college presentation, and newsletters.

When attention is turned to the fields of junior college activity with which these services dealt, the great variety of responses is bewildering. In order to afford some clarity to the presentation, the many answers have been classified under four headings three of which are traditional: curriculum, student personnel, and administration. After the answers had been classified under these three topics, it was found that just as after the miraculous feeding of the five thousand there was a great deal of provender left, so in this instance, the residue was large. The speaker

finding himself in this situation decided to take the easy way out albeit the device could scarcely be called original. He employed that old faithful heading, "Miscellaneous." Subdivisions were made under each of the main divisions, and with the indulgence of the listeners, enough of the specific answers will be listed under each subdivision to give some idea as to the nature of the services.

Improvement is the first subdivision listed under curriculum. Typical of fields involved are: engineering, business, English, general education, fine arts, television, and other subject-matter fields. Help was acknowledged in regard to modifications in course offerings and the type and quality of courses. The setting up of a remedial reading program was listed by some of the junior colleges, and others mentioned assistance in evaluation of program objectives.

Many of the respondents mentioned aid they had received in regard to the many problems associated with the transfer relations. This aid included not only the innumerable conferences that were held, to say nothing of the correspondence, but one college reported a visit by invitation to the university campus to see how well their transferred students were doing, and another listed the scholarship reports received regularly on their students who had transferred.

A third subdivision of the section on curriculum is assigned to extension courses. This apparent incongruity in the scheme of presentation is used merely as a convenience. Topics considered by extension classes include special adult classes, upholstery instruction, and in-service training classes related to the teaching efficiency of the faculty.

Instruction is the last subdivision under the general heading of curriculum. Specific topics include: stimulation of student learning, discovery of desirable qualities of junior college teachers, faculty self-evaluation techniques, laboratory equipment, library service, techniques of teaching English composition, and evaluation of general program of instruction.

The second major division used in this summary is that of student personnel. It is a matter of interest that the number of specific references to topics associated with this division was the least of the first three divisions.

Under the subdivisions of testing, the only reference was to a freshman testing program.

The second subdivision—scholarships and loans—also had only one reference—student loan fund regulations.

There was a total of four entries under the subdivision of counseling: vocational counseling service, discovery of "late blooming" students, general counseling of students, and special assistance to commerce students.

Two entries could be classified as related to housing: a consideration of the duties of the head resident, and help in formulation of dormitory and student union plans, while admission procedures was the only entry under the subdivisional heading of admission.

The third major division—administration—had exactly the same number of topics as the first: 28. The first subdivision considered under this major heading was physical plant. Illustrative of the type of topics suggested in this category were: planning new student center, help with landscaping, suggestions concerning architectural services, review of master plan,

consultation on such matters as remodeling building for library use, campus planning, building design, library repairs, and developing a master plan for expansion.

Under the subdivisional heading of staff are the following items: providing teachers from teacher placement bureau, consultation of duties of registrar, on duties of business manager, and on faculty recruitment.

Four items may be subsumed under the heading of finance: help with administrative and budget procedure, and consultation on fund raising, salaries, and purchasing.

The subdivision of general administration topics comprises the following: seminar for junior college presidents, overall survey conferences for administrative officers, the conducting of a community survey, consultation on public relations, non-profit status, and techniques of self-study and evaluation.

Three other topics suggested by junior college respondents under the heading of administration were: consultation on legal technicalities, on the legal rights of instructors, and participation in the study of the diversification of higher education.

As its name implies, the major division entitled "Miscellaneous" was a catch-all for topics not previously classified. The following are indicative: instructor-interne program, consideration of areas of needed junior college research, consultation on future plans of junior college, help with convocation programs, consultation on food services, on forms of contracts, and on the development of faculty leadership.

The speaker without any protest whatsoever acknowledges that such a listing of forms of services and of topics covered is,

to say the least, a bit monotonous. Monotony was risked, however, in an effort to present in broad detail a picture of what junior college respondents regarded as significant professional services provided by colleges and universities.

While this completes the report of the professional services provided by colleges and universities for junior colleges as reported by these two types of institutions, there is one other service that should be mentioned. This is the tremendous volume of research, good, bad, and mediocre, represented by the masters' theses and doctoral dissertations which are completed each year. Your speaker has no knowledge of the extent of these studies, but suspects that it is increasing as a result of the progressively greater number of graduate schools that are entering the field of junior college research.

The research that has been done in this form, when the spurious and that of doubtful value is removed, is a genuine service provided by colleges and universities. Unfortunately, this service all too rarely reaches the junior colleges for whom it is done. Occasionally studies like Campbell's analysis of junior college purposes, or Sims' account of the legal backgrounds, or Fretwell's evaluation of the factors surrounding the establishment of junior colleges break out of the mausoleums that provide a resting place for theses and dissertations, but such instances present the exception rather than the commonplace. Colleges and universities would render a most valuable service if they would facilitate a wider distribution.

What steps might be taken by graduate schools to expedite the movement of the results of this research into the hands of junior college staff members? There are,

no doubt, a large number possible. Only one has been selected for exposition in this paper. It is the step of encouraging more studies which are based on a synthesis of theses and dissertations that have already been written.

An illustration of this type of research by synthesis can be found in regard to criteria for establishing junior colleges. Reference has already been made to the study by Fretwell at Teachers College, Columbia. While there is no disposition to detract in the least from the value of this study, it is also recognized that this is one in a long line of considerations of this topic. Each of these studies has differed sufficiently from the others that in no sense of the word can they be considered duplications. Yet, despite this fact, each has dealt with the same topic as the preceding or succeeding ones. The time is certainly propitious for some graduate student to make a synthesis of the many studies in the field and on the basis of a critical analysis of the results give to the junior college world a truly definitive statement concerning criteria for establishing this type of institution.

It will be recognized immediately that the illustration represents only one area in which synthesis is needed. Graduate schools might do well to explore the many areas and encourage many studies of this nature.

The discussion so far has, with the exception of the last suggestion, dealt with the on or off status of college and university coats in the past and the present. Since the description of a needed type of research, however, pertains to the future, it may serve as a transition to other ideas that will require a continuation of the coats-off policy. Two such ideas will be

presented: (1) the determination of the role of the junior college, and (2) the development in colleges and universities of an institution-wide understanding of the junior college. Before taking up each of these ideas it should be kept in mind that the efforts implied will come from junior colleges on the one hand, and colleges and universities on the other engaged as equal partners in a cooperative undertaking.

No doubt if all that has ever been written about the role of the junior college were assembled in one place it would be the most nauseating sight imaginable. It would seem that everyone who has had occasion to be associated with the junior colleges either as an active participant or an interested observer has had an uncontrollable urge at some time or another to deliver himself of his own ideas concerning this role. Some of the utterances have been worth reading or listening to—others have been pure drivel. Is it time that serious thought be given to the many questions concerning the role of the junior college.

What are some of these questions? A random selection with little attempt to arrange them in any logical order might produce the following:

Is there any unique role which attaches to private junior colleges as compared with the public institutions? If there is, will this role be attained as long as many of the private institutions are content merely to imitate the public schools?

Is there a definite role to be played by church-related junior colleges? If there is, will they ever be able to play it successfully on the basis of the financial support (if it may be called that) which some of the religious denominations afford them?

What should be the status of the public

junior college in regard to the overall demands for higher education in a given state? Should the California plan be followed, or the Mississippi plan, or the New York plan, or the Wisconsin plan, or the Iowa plan, or the Texas plan, or the Washington plan, or the Kansas plan, or the Oklahoma plan, or any other plan?

To what extent are junior colleges obligated to develop a community college design? And what, incidentally, are the critical aspects of a community college? Should every junior college develop programs for terminal students, and transfer students, and part-time adult students, or should some concentrate on only one of these sets of customers? If selection of a restricted set of customers is desirable, which institutions should restrict and which should develop comprehensive programs.

When and under what circumstances, if any, should junior colleges become four-year institutions? Does such a changed status indicate that the role of a junior college is a temporary one played until the time the institution can add two more years and thereby reach a full undergraduate program? Can a four-year college successfully maintain a junior college?

It will be recognized that these are not loaded questions—that the answers to them are far from obvious. Moreover, it will be recognized that the answers to these questions have equal pertinence to junior colleges and universities. The search for answers to these questions, then, becomes a challenge to the cooperative endeavor of both types of institutions.

The second idea which implies a need for a cooperative attack, and hence a need for the universities to keep their coats off, is that of the development of an institu-

tion-wide understanding of junior colleges in many universities. Despite the fact that the base of understanding is much broader than it has ever been, and that it is steadily growing broader, there is still too much incidence of faculty members and administrators in universities who regard the junior college with a lack of understanding.

An interesting example of this deficiency was observed in connection with the work of a doctoral candidate whose dissertation concerned problems of transfer students. One portion of the study was devoted to personal interviews with university faculty members, and one faculty member in particular had been vehement in his denunciation of junior colleges as institutions for preparing students for upper division work. Another portion of the study was concerned with discovering the academic performance of transfer students in the university in which the faculty member worked. The second portion of the study showed that the two students who had the highest grades in the classes

taught by this faculty member were transfers from junior colleges.

This situation, obviously, is not typical. It is illustrative, though, of a condition that is all too common. That the case cited occurred in a university which has demonstrated a great deal of interest in the junior college movement is not rare, either. The point that is being stressed is that the best results of cooperation will be obtained when the understanding of the junior college becomes institution-wide in universities and colleges.

As the end of this paper is reached, it is hoped that three ideas have been made clear: (1) the coats of the universities have been off for a long time, are now off, and will continue to be off, (2) there are many problems in the field of higher education that have an import common to the junior colleges on the one hand and the colleges and universities on the other, and (3) these problems will inevitably yield to the cooperative attack of these two types of institutions.

Coats Off by the Two-Year Colleges

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.

IN CANVASSING my own experience I can think of at least three good reasons for taking off my coat. I took off my coat in Texas two weeks ago because the temperature was in the upper eighties. Because of my Irish heritage, I used to ask my friends, in my younger days, to hold my coat while I tried to resolve some dispute in a rather direct way. And when I can think of no good way to avoid it, I have gone to work on some job and found that removing my coat greatly contributes to freedom of action.

Why are the junior colleges removing their coats in this year 1957? I can think of at least three good reasons:

1. The atmosphere in which we work is decidedly getting warmer. Somebody said the other day that the junior college is the hottest thing in education today.
2. There is work to be done—work requiring creative thought and imagination, mental and physical exertion.
3. I am not advocating that we fight in an unpleasant way but that we become more aggressive in a polite, persistent and competent way about the role of the two-year college as a part of the total structure of education in America.

THE CLIMATE WARMS UP

Have you ever stood on the beach at

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR. is Vice President and Director of Public Information of AAJC, Washington, D.C.

high tide and watched not only the waves moving toward the shore but other waves moving out toward the ocean, kind of a backwash. When these two waves come together, one shoreward and one oceanward, what happens? There is quite a splash. There are two waves in our contemporary society that will come together very shortly and make such a splash that a lot of people are going to be affected.

At the same time that the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School makes a significant statement of national educational policy, a great tidal wave of increasing potential for college enrollment is moving in a relentless way toward the beach.

Every individual, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, shall have the opportunity to develop his or her best self, to continue appropriate education up to his or her personal point of optimum development.

You have heard the prediction of the chairman of the National Industrial Conference Board: "In the next fifteen years we will have to build in this country facilities for higher education equal to the total built since the landing of the Pilgrims."

Here are two waves of giant proportions, the first recognizing as a matter of national policy that every individual shall have the opportunity to continue appropriate education and the second, an increase in birthrate and standard of living

and societal need, an increase in the number of young people of college age desiring a college education.

So the atmosphere is getting warmer—state studies are being made: California, Ohio, Minnesota, New York, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Texas, Illinois, and other states; on a national level, the studies of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School. In every one of these studies the two-year college has been assigned a significant place in the program of higher education.

An example is taken from the Statement and Recommendations by the Board of Regents for *Meeting the Needs in Higher Education in New York State*, adopted December 21, 1956:

Two-year comprehensive community colleges, characterized by low cost to the student, geographical availability and direct responsiveness to the community needs, offering both transfer and technical-terminal programs, are considered to be the best single means of (a) accommodating future demands for higher education, (b) embracing the increasing heterogeneity of abilities as represented in the students graduating from the secondary schools and (c) providing the education necessary for an emerging group of semi-professional occupations. Community colleges have a meaning and a competence in their own right. They can provide, as well as technical-terminal education, competent preprofessional and general education instruction.

And from a conference on Industry-College Relations at White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, November, 1953, the report of Dr. Edward Hodnett:

A widespread extension of the two-year college throughout the nation is not only the most economical way of educating approximately half of the millions of high school students

who will seek college education in the future; it is also the best way.

Many similar cases could be cited. These are representative. It is clear that many of our nation's leaders are advocating that the two-year college offers the best means of meeting a large portion of our needs for greater and better opportunities for post-high school education.

WORK TO BE DONE

However, don't put your coat back on again, yet. There is a job to be done. The fact that the climate calls for the establishment and extension of two-year colleges is not enough. The truth of the matter is that many people know nothing, or next to nothing, or the wrong things about the two-year colleges. The person sitting next to you on the train asks whether or not the junior college has any role other than preparing the weak student to meet four-year college requirements for admission. The foundation representative says that his organization is not yet ready to give attention to the junior college because it is secondary education. And in the New York State Report:

"Public understanding and acceptance of two-year education is not at its optimum in this State. What is needed is more widespread dissemination of better information and data on such opportunities."

And Hodnett—"The larger question at the heart of the matter is one of social values. . . . Since the four-year college is the dominant form, going to college means going for four years, if possible. . . . Only the mobilizing of public opinion will help the average American family to see this whole matter clearly and sensibly."

James Bryant Conant—"The new status of a

local two-year college will require careful and repeated explanation in many states."

Here seems to be the crux of our problem. How can public understanding and acceptance be secured? What can we do?

THE PUBLIC INFORMATION PROJECT

This association is now sponsoring a public information project for one year. Approximately one-half of the institutions holding membership in this association have given more than \$20,000 toward this program. Both public and private colleges have contributed. A brochure describing the American two-year college is in process of publication by N. W. Ayer of Philadelphia. Contacts have been made and are in process with the foundations and large corporations of the country. Close working relationships have been established with other educational organizations of value in interpretation of this movement, such as American Alumni Council and American College Public Relations Association. The primary method of this public information program is personal contact by the director of the project with officers of the groups to be reached. Details of the program have been described at other meetings during this convention.

This program is based upon the conviction that independent, church-related, and tax-supported colleges must work together for mutual assistance and for the good of the nation as a whole. It also recognizes that national contacts can assist the individual colleges but that primary responsibility for understanding and support is the function of the individual college. There is no substitute for local action and influence. Understanding begins at home.

UNDERSTANDING BEGINS AT HOME

Temple University of Philadelphia was built upon a lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," delivered by Russell Conwell hundreds of times. The thesis is simple enough—man traveled all over the world looking for his fortune and returned home to find acres of diamonds in his own backyard. That lecture has application here. The richest resource for the college is in its own clientele. Every institution needs to look to its own constituency. If it is a church-related college, this means the church body; if a community college, then the community needs to which it ought to be responsive. A college program has value and wins support if it is of quality and based upon objectives derived from accurately perceived needs.

THE ALUMNI

Apparently the two-year colleges have done little with alumni in securing their support. Only 13 of the 272 independent and church-related colleges reported results of alumni funds to the American Alumni Council this past year. And yet one of the first questions asked by representatives of corporations and foundations is, "What is the college doing with its alumni, with the people who are in the best position to know whether or not this institution deserves support?" Granted that the problems of the two-year college might be different in this area of work from those of the four-year institutions, might there not actually be some advantage to us if we do as we claim, a superior job of teaching, of counseling, of personal attention? Would not a student tend to look back with real appreciation to an institution which met his needs in those

first two most important years of his college work?

INDUSTRY-BUSINESS FOUNDATIONS

The approach of the two-year colleges to industry and business ought to be on the basis of naturalness in accordance with their own environment, their opportunities, their services. I can think of no colleges that ought to be able to make a better case for support from the businessmen of the community than the good community college. At the Congress of American Industry sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers in New York last winter, one of the leaders of that group suggested that the colleges needed to utilize their plant and personnel more efficiently. He suggested longer hours and shorter vacation periods. The community colleges are way ahead on this score. Many of them are operating from eight in the morning until eleven at night, five days a week, twelve months of the year.

And the independent and church-related colleges can make a case for support as surely as can the four-year college. Our problem in this regard is the stereotype of picture in the mind of many businessmen and industrial leaders regarding the two-year college. But remember that there were many who knew little about the liberal arts colleges and their financial needs until a businessman-educator became an evangelist in a program of corporate support and organization of state foundations. Shoe leather has been described by presidents of many of the liberal arts colleges as the most significant ingredient in the formula of educational fund-raising. There is no substitute for face-to-face contact, and the contact which has proved most helpful is one of

the president of company with the president of the college. By the way, 13 college presidents in Indiana made 800-900 calls last year.

BE YOURSELF

The two-year college is on the "growing edge" of our culture. It is a frontier movement. Its aims should not be uniformity nor standardization. It should not seek to emulate other institutions but dare to stand for quality in its own right. The two-year college, with its wide range of programs, is the finest recognition in higher education that there are many kinds of abilities. These we recognize not in an apologetic fashion but in forthright acknowledgement of the marvelous fabric of human differences. We build our programs to serve well, in the words of John Dale Russell, "those who will contribute to the economic productivity of the state, who will be elected to public office, who will render important service in positions of civic responsibility." The "raise the standards" solution to this crisis in education is woefully inadequate in conserving the varied contributions needed by our society.

A PART OF A TOTAL MOVEMENT

There is another job to be done. The two-year colleges themselves need to recognize that they are a part of the total structure of higher education. The opportunities before us in higher education will require the fullest possible cooperation of all qualified personnel in the field, and of all kinds of institutions, public and independent. The establishment of a joint committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Association of American Colleges is an excellent move, for by a common approach to problems of

mutual concern can come the finest kind of interpretation and communication. A great deal has been done over the past several years as personnel of the junior college field have taken their places on regional and national committees. Interpretation of our work and the beneficial exposure to problems of national or regional scope for all of higher education can take place in the give-and-take of such committee activity.

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO?

Sometimes at an educational convention I sense a tremendous distance between our deliberations and the lives of the students who give us a reason for being. As we talk about buildings and finance and curriculum and legislation, do we have in mind a picture of specific young people with their marvelous potential of growth, a picture of John and Bill and Sue and Mary? This must be our reference mark in all deliberations—this is our benchmark for planning and building. I wonder then if we dare give ourselves the finest public relations test ever devised? Let me tell you a story.

Many centuries ago a small movement was just beginning. It had not received public understanding and support. There were indications that the movement held real promise for those who were in need. One man of the time named Nathaniel asked whether any good thing could come out of Nazareth. "Philip said unto him, Come and see."

This is the supreme test. We have talked about the necessity of public support. Can we say honestly and fearlessly, come and see? The people who responded to that invitation of 20 centuries ago saw results. They saw the blind receive their sight, the

lame walk, the lepers cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead raised up, and the gospel preached to the poor.

Can we say in our colleges that young people receive their sight, that they are helped to establish great objectives, that they are endowed with vision, stimulated to high goals and helped in achieving a sense of worthwhile purpose? Would those who "come to see" find youth becoming skillful and competent in expressing their latent abilities and developing the capacity to move with power and discipline?

And what of those plagued with fears and uncertainties, doubts, and feelings of inadequacy and insecurity? There are those in these hectic days. Are they being drawn to values that will heal and help? Have they felt the power of what an eighteenth-century preacher referred to as "the expulsive power of a new affection?" Are they falling in love with truth and beauty and goodness?

Are our students taught to hear? Are they sensitive to human need and tuned to the meaningful sounds of their communities and world? Do the cries from Hungary stir their hearts to constructive response?

The Master Teacher raised the dead. It has been said that a tragedy of our day is that the spirit of curiosity is suffocated and laid to rest by the time the student is graduated from college. Is this true in your school? Or will those who "come to see" find students motivated and inspired to vitality and zest for learning and living? Will they be responsive and creative and productive because the atmosphere of your institution invites those qualities of life?

And the poor had the gospel preached

to them. There is meaning in this simple statement for those in this assembly. The two-year college has often been called the "peoples college." Is it true that our doors are open to any student who can profit from his experience with us no matter how humble he might be? We have affirmed our interest in the individual. Who knows what miracles can be worked in the lives of young people of all races and colors and class when opportunities for growth are available?

Two thousand years ago the people were invited to "come and see." And we read that "they were astonished at His doctrine; for His word was with power." Our nation today needs a movement in higher education similarly characterized by power and excellence. Let the two-year colleges of this nation look to their own purposes and programs and confidently and humbly invite the citizens of this land to growing understanding and support.

Follow-up Studies in Co-educational Junior Colleges

PETER MASIKO, JR.

It is natural to ask, how am I doing? We like to feel that we are doing a good job and that we are accomplishing our objectives and goals. But how often are you asked particular questions about your college students that you answer but can not document? You may have a good hunch about what is happening, but unless you have taken pains to study a wide variety of questions covering all aspects of your college operation, you may have difficulty in convincing those who are asking the questions.

We must be prepared to answer all kinds of questions, because with the national spotlight focused on the community college as the most promising way of meeting the tremendous increase in college population in the decade ahead, it will be the responsibility of those now operating community colleges to supply the answers to such necessary questions as:

1. Do junior colleges prepare students adequately for transfer to senior colleges and universities?
2. Do junior colleges prepare students well for immediate entrance to business and industry?
3. Is the curriculum of the junior college geared to the modern needs of industry, government, and the general society?

PETER MASIKO, JR. is Executive Dean, Chicago City Junior College, Chicago, Illinois.

You can imagine many other important questions. The answers must be forthcoming. Furthermore, it will not be enough for us to say in Chicago that in the Los Angeles junior colleges students do as well in the senior colleges and universities to which they transfer as do the native students. It is not enough to report that graduates of the Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute actually enter the kind of employment for which they were trained, by better than 80 per cent. These facts are important for us to know, but each institution must be able to talk about its own product. Each junior college has its own responsibility to its own students, staff, and community.

The national follow-up study of junior college graduates now in progress under Dr. Leland L. Medsker points up the serious lack of reliable up-to-date information on our graduates. We have a professional responsibility to cooperate in such nationwide projects and we need to have such information for the efficient operation of our own institutions.

I will not attempt an exhaustive survey of follow-up studies. Instead, I will indicate some of the kinds of follow-up studies we have made in the Chicago City Junior College, with particular reference to Wright, and the results of these studies both in terms of the information learned

and the uses made of that information. In addition, reference will be made to studies made at several eastern and California junior colleges.

A striking illustration of the potential value of follow-up studies is the one we made with students transferring to the University of Chicago. We require all students to take one-half of their total two-year program in five general education courses; communications, social science, biology, physical science and humanities. Many questions had been raised about the validity and adequacy of these courses. We decided that one good way to check was to see how well our students did on the six divisions of the General Education Test, which was required of all students entering the Divisions at the University of Chicago.

We supplied the university with the names of 125 Wright graduates who were admitted to the university between 1947 and 1952. Their records were checked on the required entrance tests, and it was discovered that our graduates did as well as two-year transfers from Harvard, Yale, and other highly rated liberal arts colleges. Fifty-seven per cent were admitted with no deficiency and 34 per cent were admitted with one deficiency. Most of these deficiencies were in mathematics, which is not required for graduation from the junior college. There were no failures on the English comprehension examination.

So pleased were the university officials with these findings that they extended the study to all junior college graduates with the same general result. As a result of such factual information, the university has since set up 30 full tuition scholarships each year for Chicago City Junior

College graduates. The admissions officer comes to the campus to interview scholarship candidates, and the successful ones are no longer required to take the entrance examinations.

A study just completed gives us information about Wright graduates who also graduated from eight Chicago area colleges and universities. Eighty-three randomly selected graduates had their junior college grade point averages compared with their grade point averages at the senior college. With C equal to 2; B, 3; and A, 4, the combined average at Wright was 2.75 and 2.73 at the eight colleges and universities. The breakdown by colleges showed that Wright students improved their average at four colleges and did less well at the remaining four. These facts will be useful in advising with students about colleges they should consider after junior college graduation. It is interesting to note the fact that our graduates made the best showing at colleges specializing in teacher education.

We have been encouraging more of our students to enter the teaching profession. In the spring of 1956 we sent a questionnaire to students who had been at Wright four years previously and who at that time indicated they were planning to go into teaching. Of those who responded, 52 per cent were actually teaching, with more than half of these teaching in Chicago.

Follow-up studies need not be concerned only with graduates. One of the apparent facts of public junior college enrollments is that two-thirds of the students are freshmen and one-third sophomores. Another is that only a relatively small percentage of the entering students ever graduate, indicating high student

mortality and implying a failure on the part of the college to satisfy its clientele. Such allegations fail to comprehend the many different functions of the community college. We are now studying 100 randomly selected full-time day freshmen who entered the college in September, 1955. One year later 62 had registered for the second year, 9 had entered employment, 9 had entered the armed forces, 7 had transferred, 7 were excluded for scholastic reasons, 3 had to quit because work schedules could not be adjusted to class schedules, 2 had married, and 1 was not accounted for. This hardly supports the notion that the college was failing to satisfy its students.

In talking with personnel directors, we have emphasized the advantages to them of encouraging their employees to enroll in the evening credit program in the junior college. Almost 60 per cent of the nearly 15,000 persons registered for credit in the five branches of the Chicago City Junior College attend the extended day classes. In a recent study of the evening students, with almost 2,500 responses, it was learned that 92 per cent worked full time, and an additional three per cent worked part time. Ninety-two per cent indicated they felt their junior college experience would help improve their chances for a promotion or to get a better job; 71 per cent indicated they planned to continue beyond two years of college education.

In 1951 a 65-item questionnaire was sent to 2,500 alumni who had attended Wright between September, 1936, and June, 1950, and 868 replies were received and tabulated. This gave us a comprehensive evaluation of our program. Each of the required general courses was evalu-

ated, and many major changes in the courses resulted. None of the departments concerned wants its course to be considered the poorest or least organized course. Hence, continuous curriculum development takes place. A comparable survey given to every graduating class since makes it possible for the departments concerned to see what progress they are making.

We learned that less than 10 per cent of those who continued at other colleges had problems relating to transfer of credits. Many of the problems did not reflect lack of willingness on the part of the colleges to accept the credits but were related to changes in curriculums in senior colleges and transferring more than 66 credit hours. Our major problem in this connection continues to be how to hold to our required 30 hours of general education and at the same time provide science and engineering students with all the courses they should have in their specialties. Seventy-nine per cent of the alumni thought the amount of required hours was about right.

A crucial question asked was: If you attended another college, would you say the instruction you received at Wright by comparison was better, as good, or poorer. The per cent responses were: better—20 per cent, as good—65 per cent, poorer—15 per cent. To the question, Assuming similar conditions, would you send your child to Wright, only seven per cent replied no.

The written responses to the question, What courses would you have liked to have taken at Wright that were not available, gave considerable impetus to the setting up of a home economics laboratory and to the introduction of a series of

courses in this field as well as in child psychology and preparation for marriage. Additional support had also come from former students who attended the non-credit adult courses and had been asked to indicate what kinds of courses we should offer.

A follow-up of its graduates is a regular procedure at the Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute at Farmingdale, New York. This junior college was opened in 1946 and each graduating class has been followed up each year since. The 1956 Report on Placement and Progress of Graduates shows that very large percentages enter and remain in employment in the field for which they were trained. As is the case in all colleges, it is difficult to locate many graduates after the lapse of several years. Of the 216 graduates in the Industrial-Technical Division in the first class in June, 1948, 118 or 55 per cent responded to the survey in December, 1955. One hundred ten represent the "sample"; 86 per cent were employed in the field for which they were trained. Average salaries had risen from \$51 per week in 1948 to \$122 in 1955.

These reports give specific details of individuals placed and the firms employing these individuals. This certainly is excellent public relations. Similar reports are printed for the graduates of the agriculture, ornamental horticulture and related fields. Of the 153 graduates in June, 1948, 149 responded to a survey made in December, 1953; 17 were still in college, 13 were in the armed forces, and 4 were housewives. Of the remaining 117, 88 per cent were still employed in the specific field for which they were trained. Average salaries rose from \$52 per week in 1948 to \$92 in December, 1953, with a high of

\$125 per week. Each curriculum has its own box score year by year so that it is possible to tell at a glance how many students are graduated from each curriculum and what the graduates are doing.

East Contra Costa Junior College regularly makes a survey of graduates. It is a new college and has only a limited number of classes which have graduated, but much valuable information can be gleaned from the returns. Even within a single year substantial changes have been noted in the percentage of graduates entering full-time employment and those continuing their college studies. Thus, 75 per cent of the 1953 graduates transferred to senior colleges, while only 46 per cent of the 1954 graduates transferred. Part of this substantial difference may be accounted for by the difference in the percentage of questionnaires returned. The survey of the 1953 class had a 52 per cent return, while the 1954 survey had a 90 per cent return. This factor, which is present in all such surveys, must be evaluated before correct conclusions can be drawn. In spite of some possible distortion on this account, the difference in the percentages going on to college is of concern to the college and will have some effect on its total program. Part of the explanation lies in the fact that of the 1953 graduates 80 per cent were men, while of the 1954 graduates only 70 per cent were men. Another contributing factor may have been the employment situation in the county.

Other opinions sought related to the evaluation of the faculty, counseling services, the courses required for graduation, athletics, student government, club activities and social affairs. The responses give the faculty and administration valuable clues as to the areas which need re-exami-

nation and renewed effort. Student-faculty relationships were rated highly, while social activities, student government and club activities received the least favorable ratings. I suspect these are common ailments of the public junior college with a commuting student body.

Pasadena City College conducts yearly surveys of its graduates. They learn about their graduates what most of us learn about ours when we conduct follow-up studies, but each college will do something a bit different so that we can learn something new from each survey we read. For example, a 92 per cent response from the 1955 graduating class of 781 revealed that 86 per cent of the graduates of terminal curriculums and 90 per cent of the graduates of transfer curriculums still preferred the field of work for which they prepared at City College.

Terminal graduates were asked, Did your education at Pasadena City College satisfactorily prepare you for your employment? The men responded as follows: 75 per cent yes, 21 per cent no, and 4 per cent partially. The women responded 82 per cent yes, 13 per cent no, and 5 per cent partially. This would appear to be an extremely favorable condition, indicating an alert counseling service and close coordination with local business and industry.

As might be expected, considerable numbers of college transfer students did not immediately continue their college studies but took full-time jobs after City College graduation. Out of a potential 490 transfer students, 125 accepted jobs after graduation. Conversely, many of the students graduating from terminal curriculums continued with full-time college programs, while others became post-

graduate students at City College. After a brief experience in industry many came back to college at night to take courses in mathematics and physics, courses which many students carefully avoid while in regular attendance. We are, of course, pleased to learn from the January, 1957, issue of the *Junior College Journal* that Pasadena's transfer students, in common with those of most other junior colleges, do at least as well in baccalaureate institutions as students who have spent their entire four years in these colleges and universities.

These are but a few of the valuable items of information that we can learn from follow-up studies. The experiences at other junior colleges throughout America, as well as our own experiences in Chicago, gave us the necessary assurances that our staff was capable of undertaking the largest open-circuit college credit television experiment in the country. In September, 1956, we enrolled 1,364 students in four televised courses.

Only by continuous follow-up studies can you learn how your graduates are doing. Their success is a reflection of the quality of your staff and the soundness of the instructional program. The records of our graduates at other colleges and universities and the volume of placements in business and industry gave us the courage to make bold plans for the junior college in Chicago. In May, 1956, Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, General Superintendent of Schools in Chicago, presented a junior college blueprint for the next 15 years to the Board of Education. Some of our junior college staff members aided in the preparation of this report, and Dr. Bogue served as a consultant. This report recommended an expansion in the number of

branches from three to seven by the fall of 1958. We are on schedule to date; we opened the fourth unit in September, 1956, and the fifth in February, 1957.

Amundsen, the fourth unit, opened with 795 students in September and enrolled 1,162 in February. The fifth unit, Southeast, opened a month ago with 508 students. The combined enrollment for all branches has increased from 12,639 in February, 1956, to 15,536 in February, 1957.

With the knowledge gleaned from

follow-up studies, we can take off our hats to the past. We may well be proud of our accomplishments. These same studies also point out areas of weakness which are a challenge to us. With all the challenges staring us in the face, we will have to take our coats off in the days ahead. This dynamic, young, flexible, alert service institution, the community college, will rise to the occasion and successfully meet the challenge. As good salesmen who know their product, we know what we are talking about.

The Executive Secretary's Annual Report

JESSE P. BOGUE

IN THIS my eleventh annual report, I am happy to state that associations with your officers, the Board of Directors, the committees, and with all the colleges have been pleasant and rewarding. You made it possible for Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. to take a leave of absence from Graceland College and direct the Public Information Project. He has greatly strengthened the work of the Association. I am confident that his efforts will be of real value in the future growth and development of the junior and community colleges.

MEMBERSHIP

Your Association now has the largest membership in its history. There are 474 colleges, 21 organizational sustaining members, 90 individual and 12 honorary members. When the dues were increased by your action at the last convention, some concern was felt that it might result in membership cancellations. This has not been the case. In fact, response to notices for dues mailed in January of this year has been greater than in any previous year to my knowledge. Moreover, every institution and individual holding membership in 1956 paid dues. Naturally, we would like to see in the Association every junior college eligible for membership. To this end we shall continue our efforts by persuasion and by demonstrating the values of membership.

JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Your *Junior College Journal* has the largest circulation in its history. The total subscriptions are nearly 4,000. Of course, this record can and should be greatly exceeded for there should be now a circulation of at least 10,000. Financially, the *Journal* more than paid for itself last year. If the expense, however, for secretarial and associate editorial salaries to the University of Texas had been charged against the *Journal*, there would have been a deficit. I wish to give credit to Dr. Reynolds, the editor, to his associate editor, Mrs. Marion Kennedy, and the Editorial Board for constant improvement of the *Journal* whereby people have wanted to subscribe and read its contents. Credit must be given also to Mrs. Hattie Vernson in the Washington office for securing advertising and promoting subscriptions. We are grateful to our advertisers and express here our appreciation for their support.

NEWSLETTER

You have probably observed that the *Newsletter* has been improved in appearance during the past few months. This is apparently appreciated by the membership because the number of group subscriptions has been substantially increased. The circulation is now approximately 1,600. We believe that the *Newsletter* could be a source of help to all colleges if it were placed in the hands of news-

paper editors, members of boards of control, and leading citizens in each community where there is a junior college.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The fourth edition of *American Junior Colleges*, a volume of 584 pages, was published in 1956 by the American Council on Education with the executive secretary as editor. Its circulation is about 9,000 copies, and it is used rather extensively as a resource book. We also published four new pamphlets which were mailed to all junior colleges and some of them have been sold in considerable numbers. They were written by President Robert Gordon Sproul of the University of California, Dr. Arthur S. Adams, President of the American Council on Education, Dr. Roy S. Simpson, Superintendent of Public Instruction for California, and by the executive secretary. These publications have been especially helpful to persons in authority for the determination of far-reaching educational policies. *The firm statement of educational policies in the state of California has helped to create more serious attention to this matter in a number of other states.* Here again, we recommend that local colleges consider the wisdom of using short, readable pamphlets to promote a better understanding of and attitudes toward the junior and community college movement. A considerable number of colleges are doing an outstanding job in this respect.

FIELD WORK

You have been informed from month to month of our whereabouts in field work. There were 20 trips made during the year, lasting from one to 21 days each, or a total of 98 days on the road. All of these

were devoted to local, state, regional, or national meetings. In addition to out-of-city trips, numerous ones were made in Washington with governmental agencies and with other educational associations. Extensive correspondence was carried on during the year. The *Junior College Directory* materials were collected, edited, and published, and we attempted to make our two contributions to the *Junior College Journal* for each of the nine issues worthwhile for the readers. Without going into detail about the year's work, we can say that we have attempted to keep alive, alert, and abreast to every issue of importance to the junior and community college movement in the several states, the federal government, among church groups, and voluntary associations of different types.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

Under way at the present time are the following research and experimental programs of importance to the junior and community colleges:

1. President's Committee on Education Beyond High School.
2. The experimental nursing program.
3. Studies in the diversification of higher education.
4. The Public Information Project.
5. The three-year advertising campaign by the Advertising Council of America.
6. The moving picture on higher education being made by the Educational Foundation of Sears, Roebuck & Company.
7. Television teaching experiments at Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, the junior colleges of the city of Chicago, and in the junior colleges of Los Angeles.
8. Further studies on the per student cost for operating junior colleges. Two studies, a per student cost study and a

salary study for private and public junior colleges have been completed by C. C. Colvert, The University of Texas, and will be published in the *Journal*.

9. Building requirements for junior colleges of 500 or 1,000 or more students. Cost of junior college buildings in the form of a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Colvert at The University of Texas was completed last fall by Dr. Marvin Baker and will be published in the *Journal* in the fall of 1957.
10. The organization and financing of junior colleges within the several states.
11. A study of the "late bloomers" and the statistical studies under way now by the American Council on Education.

All these studies carry heavy implications for the junior colleges. In addition to these of major importance there are many others that are in process at various universities.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps further evidence of our efforts will be revealed in the program of this

convention. We express here our appreciation for the full cooperation you have given during the past year. The junior and community college movement is being widely recognized today as of greater significance than during any previous time. With continued cooperative efforts in plans and work, we believe that these colleges now established and to be established will be able to extend their values in education to millions of our youth and adults. We are now educating more than three-quarters of a million. We predict that within the next ten years this number will be doubled and probably trebled. In 1945-46 the enrollments were 294,475, but in 1955-56 they were 765,551. On the basis of this record during the past 10 years and with the future demands for education beyond high school as we know they will be, we are confident that our prediction for the next 10 years is based on very reasonable assumptions.

The National Survey of Technical Institute Education

THERE IS an increasing need for technically trained personnel at the junior college level. This need emphasizes the timeliness and purpose of the National Survey of Technical Institute Education now being made by the American Society for Engineering Education under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. All of us in the junior colleges can benefit from the information secured.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this survey is to collect and correlate facts, opinions, and philosophies reflecting the present status and trends of that zone of higher education which is devoted to the development of engineering technicians and other types of scientific and technological supporting personnel.

The last previous comprehensive study made in this important manpower area was the Wickenden-Spahr Study conducted in 1928-29 by the Society with the supporting assistance of the Carnegie Corporation and published in 1931. This 1956-57 national survey is being conducted by the Technical Institute Division of the Society, again with a supporting grant from the Carnegie Corporation, to ascertain and to present a correlated record and analysis of the significant developments and experiences of the intervening quarter-century, and to reveal the trends and potentialities of education

at the technical-institute level as defined in a subsequent paragraph.

The area of educational effort and manpower utilization represented in the engineering and scientific technician is one of currently critical and rapidly growing importance to the nation as a whole and to the individuals and communities involved.

BACKGROUND

In a competitive world increasingly dependent upon technology, not only the standard of living but the very survival of a free society depend upon both the scope and the efficiency of technological development. Such progress is principally the product of a manpower "team" comprising the scientists, engineers, and engineering technicians.

The research scientists turn up new information, new materials, and new ideas. The engineers make effective use of the results of the work of the scientists by creating designs and working out procedures to serve human needs. The engineering technicians contribute to this cooperative effort by completing the plans, and by building, testing, operating, and servicing equipment which each year grows increasingly complex. The engineering technician also performs vital liaison between the professional man and the skilled craftsman; between engineering and plant management. He plays a vital and essential part in the expanding

"engineering team." This "team" is interdependent. Its effectiveness depends upon a proper balance of appropriately qualified manpower.

Manpower requirements of the technological team are progressively demanding. Each new idea or bit of new information resulting from the research of a scientist requires the work of many engineers to make design applications in the many different fields affected. Similarly, the effectiveness of the work of the engineer is enhanced through the supporting use of qualified engineering technicians. Too many engineers now find themselves required to do the work of engineering technicians, whereas they should be free to function at the higher level for which they were educated. This misapplication of manpower works to the ultimate detriment of the national economy.

NEED FOR SURVEY

Present indications point to the need for from 30,000 to 40,000 four-year engineering graduates each year. This is about 200 engineers per million of population, a figure closely paralleling the ratios now existing in other modern industrial nations of the world. However, only about half that many are being graduated each year. Further, these engineers are only a part of the aforementioned engineering team which may require several engineering technicians for each graduate engineer. Paradoxically, the national educational pattern is unbalanced in the opposite direction, with less than one-third the needed number of technicians graduating from recognized educational courses of the technical-institute type.

Thus, although the nation may need more than double the number of engi-

neers currently being graduated, its even more critical need appears to be for several times the number of formally trained engineering technicians that can be produced through presently recognized educational programs. To date, the development of training for engineering technicians and other such scientific supporting personnel has been diverse in method, individual in nature, and influenced more by local expediency than by long-range objective.

To provide the nation with the engineering technicians it needs in the foreseeable future requires intelligent planning, and the coordination of effort among industry, the technical sciences, the schools and colleges, and the general public. The first step is to assay the present situation nationally, to provide basic factual information. Such is the objective of this survey.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this survey the following definitions are set forth.

"Engineering Technician"—In general, the engineering technician is a person whose interests and activities are directed chiefly toward the application and operation of engineering or scientific equipment or processes. Classified on the basis of educational certification, the engineering technician would be a graduate of a technical-institute type of curriculum as accredited by Engineers' Council for Professional Development, or recognized equivalent. Classified occupationally, the engineering technician performs semi-professional functions of an engineering or scientific nature, largely upon his own initiative and under only general super-

vision of a professional engineer or scientist.

Typical among the wide array of semi-professional functions performed by engineering and scientific technicians are: drafting, design, and development of engineering plant; testing, installing, inspecting, operating, and maintaining engineering or scientific equipment; and estimating costs, selling, and advising customers on the use of engineering or scientific equipment.

In many instances, the technician may serve as a liaison between the engineer or scientist on the one hand, and the skilled craftsman or layman on the other hand. In carrying out these various activities, the technician must be able to communicate mathematically, scientifically, and linguistically.

"Technical Institute Education"—More fully stated, this would be: "Technical Institute *Type* of Education." The term refers to the intermediate strata of technological curricula which are from 1 to 3 years duration (full-time) beyond the high-school level. Curricula are technological in nature, and they differ in both content and purpose from those of the vocational school on the one hand, and from those of the engineering college on the other hand.

Such curricula emphasize the understanding of basic principles of mathematics and science, rather than the acquisition of manual skills. High school graduation is required for admission, and mathematics through algebra and geometry usually are prerequisite.

The programs of instruction are similar in nature to, but briefer and more completely technical in content than, profes-

sional engineering curricula. The major purpose is to prepare individuals for various technical positions or specialized areas of activity encompassed within the broad field of engineering enterprise.

SCOPE

For the purposes of this survey, education and industry are inseparably interrelated. The word "industry" is used broadly to include all related engineering and scientific activities.

In the area of education, the plan is to contact all institutions of higher learning interested in offering intermediate curricula in engineering technologies and related subject matter designed to develop engineering technicians or other types of technological or scientific supporting personnel. In addition to established technical institutes, this will include evening divisions or extension divisions of colleges and universities, junior colleges, and other schools where prescribed curricula of the indicated nature leading to a recognized Certificate or Associate Degree may be offered. General contact will be made by mail through the inevitable questionnaire, and this will be supplemented widely by direct visitations with representative institutions of each type selected necessarily on a sampling basis.

In the industrial area, direct visitations will be made on a sampling basis with typical industries representative of the locality. The purpose here is to obtain a representative and informative index of the present status and indicated trend of manpower utilization and need in the classification area of the "engineering technician" as defined.

PROCEDURE

To provide a local approach, and to secure the obvious benefits of local talent with first-hand knowledge and experience, the survey is being conducted on a regional basis. In each geographical area a regional committee will establish and correlate the work of local visitation teams. Local visitation reports will be correlated on a regional basis, and then regional reports will be correlated on a national basis.

Actual visitations will be made by qualified persons currently engaged in technical institute education, sympathetically cognizant of institutional problems. The indication is that discussions are likely to turn out to be bilateral in nature, and hence of mutual benefit.

RESULTS

In the final analysis, the purpose of this survey is to provide a reliable up-to-date body of information which will help to place in proper perspective the technical-institute zone of higher education as an integral part of the American technical education process. The long-range

objective is to provide a reference guide to the evolution of a program which will meet the nation's needs for engineering technicians in the coming years, in due proportion to its over-all needs for technical manpower and in the light of its available and foreseeable supply.

HISTORY

Since the time of the Wickenden-Spahr Study of Engineering and Technical Institute Education, published in 1931, the Society has experienced a growing interest in what has come to be known as the technical-institute zone of higher education. In 1950, this led to the formation of the Technical Institute Division of the Society, absorbing and expanding the long-established Technical Institute Committee. In 1954, the Society's General Council approved a proposal by the Technical Institute Division that a new and specific study of status and trends be made in the technical-institute zone of educational, industrial, and professional activity. In December of 1955, the Carnegie Corporation endorsed this project and provided a grant of \$38,000 for its conduct.

American Association of Junior Colleges

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RESERVE FUND

Bethesda-Chevy Chase Branch Perpetual Building Association \$9,839.23

CURRENT FUNDS

Receipts	Budget 1956	Actual 1956	Budget 1957
Cash brought from 1955	\$ 1,540.77	\$ 1,540.77	\$ 836.68
Membership dues	28,800.00	30,202.50	37,200.00
Junior College Journal	7,600.00	9,071.63	9,000.00
Junior College Newsletter	250.00	305.30	400.00
Other Publications	1,600.00	1,096.21	1,000.00
Honoraria and Travel	2,500.00	2,430.31	2,000.00
Annual Meeting	3,600.00	3,840.61	1,400.00
Miscellaneous	775.00	1,031.69	500.00
Total Receipts	\$46,665.77	\$49,519.02	\$52,336.68
Expenditures:			
Exec. Secretary Salary and Retirement	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00
Exec. Secretary Travel	2,700.00	2,700.00	2,500.00
Office Salaries	6,975.11	6,910.13	8,200.00
Social Security	228.00	230.52	278.00
Office Expenses	4,200.00	4,556.31	5,600.00
Junior College Journal	8,000.00	7,984.32	8,600.00
Junior College Newsletter	1,400.00	1,513.86	2,500.00
Other Publications	1,500.00	1,460.18	2,000.00
Annual Meeting	3,161.66	3,168.09	1,900.00
Board of Directors	2,100.00	2,060.99	2,000.00
Research Committees	1,000.00	946.04	1,200.00
University of Texas	3,126.00	3,411.90	3,332.00
Miscellaneous	275.00	460.00	500.00
Capital Expenses	000.00	000.00	1,000.00
Contingencies	000.00	000.00	726.68
Total Expenditures	\$46,665.77	\$47,402.34	\$52,336.68
Cash on Hand, Riggs National Bank, December 31, 1956			\$ 2,116.68
Petty Cash Fund			\$ 75.00

Carried forward \$980 Membership Dues and \$300 from Annual Meeting fees paid in 1956 for 1957. Balance \$836.68 to be carried forward in 1957.

JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

JAMES W. REYNOLDS, *Editor*

MARION KENNEDY, *Associate Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Representing the Regional Junior College Associations

FREDERICK C. FERRY, JR.
*Pine Manor Junior College
Wellesley, Massachusetts*

WARD H. AUSTIN
*Marion Junior College
Kentfield, California*

HORACE J. WUBBEN
*Mesa County Junior College
Grand Junction, Colorado*

BONNIE E. CONE
*Charlotte College
Charlotte, North Carolina*

WILLIAM N. ATKINSON, *Chairman*
*Jackson Junior College
Jackson, Michigan*

PHILLIP KLEIN
*Harcum Junior College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania*

JOHN S. GRIFFITH
*Multnomah College
Portland, Oregon*

BOOK REVIEW EDITORS

JAMES BLASING
*Pueblo College
Pueblo, Colorado*

EDMOND M. GAGEY
*Bradford Junior College
Bradford, Massachusetts*

KENNETH HOGAN
*Pueblo College
Pueblo, Colorado*

J. V. HOWELL
*Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina*

MARGUERITE JENKINS
*Meridian Junior College
Meridian, Mississippi*

WILLIAM KEPLEY
*Coordinator of Instructional
Services for Junior Colleges
Los Angeles Board of Education
Los Angeles, California*

REBA K. NEEL
*Lee College
Baytown, Texas*

IONE PETERSON
*Pueblo College
Pueblo, Colorado*

MEYER WEINBURG
*Wright Junior College
Chicago, Illinois*

VERNON E. WOOD
*Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina*

American Association of Junior Colleges

JAMES M. EWING, *President*
*Delta State College
Cleveland, Mississippi*

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR., *Vice-President*
*and Director of Public Information,
Washington, D. C.*

JESSE P. BOGUE, *Executive Secretary*
Washington, D. C.

R. I. MELAND, *Convention Secretary*
*Austin Junior College
Austin, Minnesota*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EDWARD G. SCHLAEFER
*Monmouth College
West Long Branch, New Jersey*

RALPH PRATOR
*Bakersfield College
Bakersfield, California*

DWIGHT BAIRD
*Trinidad State Junior College
Trinidad, Colorado*

GEORGE O. KILDOW
*North Idaho Junior College
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho*

BLAKE TEWKESBURY
*Keystone College
LaPlume, Pennsylvania*

RALPH M. LEE
*Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina*

RAYMOND C. WASS
*Lasell Junior College
Auburndale, Massachusetts*

RESEARCH AND SERVICE COMMITTEES

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.,
*Coordinator of Research
Washington, D. C.*

C. C. COLVERT,
*Assistant Coordinator of Research
University of Texas
Austin, Texas*

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

WILLIAM N. ATKINSON, *Editorial Board*
*Jackson Junior College
Jackson, Michigan*

FREDERICK T. GILES, *Administration*
*Everett Junior College
Everett, Washington*

PHILIP C. MARTIN, *Curriculum*
*Westchester Community College,
White Plains, New York*

HENRY W. LITTLEFIELD, *Subcommittee on Nursing Education*
*Junior College of Connecticut
Bridgeport, Connecticut*

CHARLES L. HARMAN, *Instruction*
*Bluefield College
Bluefield, Virginia*

THOMAS M. SPENCER, *Legislation*
*Blinn College
Brenham, Texas*

VAL H. WILSON, *Student Personnel*
*Colorado Woman's College
Denver, Colorado*

Published in March ...

**Economics: An Introduction to
Analysis and Policy, 2nd Ed.**

by G. L. BACH, Carnegie Institute of Technology

MAINTAINING A SOUND BALANCE BETWEEN macro- and micro-economics, the new 1957 edition of Bach's text has been greatly strengthened by the addition of three new major chapters (totalling nearly 100 pages) on the foundations of economic progress, economic growth in America, and economic growth in the under-developed areas. Economic problems of America and Russia receive strong emphasis.

346 pages • 6" x 9" • Text Price \$6.75

**Introduction to Modern
Business, 2nd Edition**

by HILTON D. SHEPHERD, Director, Shephard Associates,
Management Consultants, VERNON A. MUSSELMAN,
University of Kentucky, and EUGENE H. HUGHES,
University of Houston

CONTAINING A WEALTH OF UP-TO-DATE occupational information, this newly revised text actually helps students select future business careers. It shows them specific job openings in business, describing the advantages and disadvantages of the various occupations. The new, 2nd Edition features: a new business case problem for each chapter • more emphasis on economics • a new chapter of Business Law and Ethics • revised material on careers in business • expanded treatment of life insurance, stock market, and business financing • new improved handling of vocational guidance material.

535 pages • 6" x 9" • Published 1955
Text Price \$5.85

Published in April ...

**Principles of Accounting,
Introductory, 5th Edition**

by HARRY A. FINNEY, C.P.A. and HERBERT E. MILLER, C.P.A.

FEATURES OF THE NEW EDITION: GIVES greater consideration to the needs and interests of the non-major, without losing any of its suitability for courses primarily for the accounting major. Adopts modern terminology • Makes the earlier chapters easier, yet preserves a chapter sequence that will introduce the accounting cycle in logical order • Improves the theory balance throughout the text • Revises organization of several topics to avoid presenting material on any given topic in two or more locations within the text • Adds several topics that offer background information useful to all business administration students.

approx. 760 pages • 6" x 9" • Price to be announced

approval copies available from—

PRENTICE-HALL, INC.

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey